

FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED NON-RESIDENT GRADUATE
STUDENTS TO ATTEND AN OUT-OF-STATE
UNIVERSITY

By

ROBERT KELLY POINSETT

//
Bachelor of Science in Education
Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, Missouri
1962

Master of Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri
1965

Bachelor of Divinity
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas
1967

Specialist in Education
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1975

Thesis
1975D
P752f
Cop. 2



FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED NON-RESIDENT GRADUATE
STUDENTS TO ATTEND AN OUT-OF-STATE
UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

Richard M. Robb

Thesis Adviser

Kenneth H. Clair

Thomas A. Garner

Lawrence M. Hynson Jr.

N. N. Dunton

Dean of the Graduate College

963966

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Sincere gratitude is expressed to all persons who had a part in making this dissertation possible, including the respondents who participated in this study.

My sincerest appreciation to the following people who contributed greatly to the completion of this study. Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, chairman of my advisory committee, whose sincere concern and personal efforts were given generously; Dr. Richard Robl, who served as thesis adviser and personal counselor, for his encouragement and unending assistance; Dr. Thomas Karman and Dr. Larry Hynson, members of the committee, for advice and interest in this work; Dr. Robert S. Brown, for technical assistance, patience, and insights; Dr. Norman Durham, for assistance in sponsoring the study; Dr. Bill Salwaechter, Title III Supervisor, for permitting my graduate work to have greatest priority in my responsibilities to him; my wife, Brenda, who unselfishly gave encouragement, patience, love and prayers in this effort; my professional associates who gave words of encouragement along the way; and above all, to the provisions of Jesus Christ, without whom the fulfillment of this graduate program would never have come about.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Background and Value of the Study	5
Assumptions	7
Limitations	7
Definition of Terms	8
Summary	9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Literature on Factors Influencing Students'	
Choice of College	11
General Studies	11
Graduate/Professional School Studies	17
Summary	23
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE	24
Introduction	24
Population	24
Sample	25
Instrumentation	25
Data Collection	30
Analysis of Data	31
Summary	33
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	34
Introduction	34
Description of Subjects	35
Distribution of the Respondents by States	35
Degrees and Majors of the Respondents	35
Personal Information of the Respondents	39
Personal Reasons for Pursuing Graduate	
Studies	41
Choosing a Graduate College	44
Financing Education	49

Chapter	Page
Analysis of Factors	55
Analysis Covering All Respondents	55
Analysis Covering Specified Categories of Respondents	63
Summary	83
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	85
Introduction	85
Description of Subjects	86
Summary of Findings	86
Analysis of Factors Covering All Respondents	87
Analysis of Factors Covering Specified Categories of Respondents	88
Conclusions	91
Recommendations for Further Research	95
Concluding Statement	100
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	101
APPENDIXES	103
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE	104
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENT	108
APPENDIX C - FIELDS OF GRADUATE STUDY	113
APPENDIX D - RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC DEGREE GROUPS	117
APPENDIX E - RESPONDENTS BY GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS	120
APPENDIX F - RESPONDENTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION GROUPS	126
APPENDIX G - RESPONDENTS BY STIPEND STATUS GROUPS	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. All Full- and Part-Time Graduate Students Migrating From Other States to Public Graduate Colleges in Oklahoma	4
II. Geographic Distribution of All Full- and Part-Time Non-Oklahoma Graduate Students Enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College During the 1975 Spring Semester	36
III. Degree Program in Which Respondents Were Enrolled	38
IV. Graduate College Groups in Which Respondents Were Enrolled	39
V. Distribution of Respondents by Age	40
VI. Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status and Children	42
VII. Reasons for Pursuing Graduate Studies	43
VIII. Reasons for Choosing to Attend OSU as Given by Respondents Who Were Formally Admitted to Graduate Programs at Other Institutions	46
IX. Reasons for Choosing to Attend OSU as Given by Respondents Who Indicated Their Choice Was Dictated by Some Other Circumstances	47
X. Factors Respondents Considered to be Among the Three Most Important Reasons for Their Selection of Department and/or Graduate Program at OSU	48
XI. Distribution of Stipend Awards by Geographic Regions	50
XII. Distribution of Stipend Awards by Graduate College Groups	50
XIII. Distribution of Stipend Awards by Sex, Marital Status, Children, Age, and Degree	52
XIV. Number and Percentage Distribution of Responses to Institutional Factors	57

Table	Page
XV. Number and Percentage Distribution of Responses to Economic Factors	58
XVI. Number and Percentage Distribution of Responses to Situational Factors	59
XVII. Number and Percentage Distribution of Responses to Personal Factors	60
XVIII. Identification of Academic Degree Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Institutional Factors	65
XIX. Identification of Academic Degree Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Economic Factors	66
XX. Identification of Academic Degree Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Situational Factors	67
XXI. Identification of Academic Degree Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Personal Factors	68
XXII. Identification of Graduate College Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Institutional Factors	70
XXIII. Identification of Graduate College Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Economic Factors	71
XXIV. Identification of Graduate College Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Situational Factors	72
XXV. Identification of Graduate College Groups Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Personal Factors	73

Table	Page
XXVI. Identification of Students by Geographic Regions Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Institutional Factors	75
XXVII. Identification of Students by Geographic Regions Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Economic Factors	76
XXVIII. Identification of Students by Geographic Regions Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Situational Factors	77
XXIX. Identification of Students by Geographic Regions Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Personal Factors	78
XXX. Identification of Students by Stipend Status Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Institutional Factors	79
XXXI. Identification of Students by Stipend Status Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Economic Factors	80
XXXII. Identification of Students by Stipend Status Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Situational Factors	81
XXXIII. Identification of Students by Stipend Status Indicating Either Decisive or Strong Consideration, or Slight or No Consideration Based on Responses Exceeding Fifty Percent for Personal Factors	82

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

The distribution of some 940,000 graduate students¹ enrolled in 833 public and private institutions² providing graduate programs poses some interesting questions for persons concerned with the process utilized by students selecting a graduate institution. Questions reflecting this interest are: What factors do graduate students consider important in selecting a graduate college? Who and what is influential in the decision? Are the faculty and research facilities important factors? How successful are the various graduate institutions in attracting the kinds of graduate students who can benefit most from their particular educational programs?

Perhaps one of the more pressing needs for valid information about graduate colleges occurs in connection with factors influencing students residing in one state to choose to attend an institution outside their home state. Once they decide to pursue graduate studies, it is likely that prospective graduate students are confronted with various options in selecting from among many institutions offering graduate

¹United States Office of Education, Digest of Educational Statistics - 1973 Edition (Washington, 1974), p. 70.

²United States Office of Education, Education Directory 1973-74 - Higher Education (Washington, 1974), p. xxiii.

programs. Options related to financial assistance, admissions requirements, and employment opportunities are likely considered when they make their selection of a graduate college. In addition, prospective graduate students trying to select an appropriate graduate program may have to weigh carefully the advice received from their college teachers, their colleagues, and their families. The students with exceptional academic ability may have to deal with another consideration: the persuasiveness of various institutional representatives competing for their talents.

In view of the geographical dispersion of public institutions offering graduate programs in the United States, it may be concluded that, in most cases, comprehensive higher educational opportunities are generally available at the graduate level without the necessity of leaving one's home state. However, a number of students do elect to attend graduate institutions outside their permanent area of residence even though the opportunity for graduate education in their selected field may be available within the boundaries of their home state.

The choice and subsequent enrollment in a graduate or professional school represents the culmination of a complex process which is influenced by a large number of interacting forces.³ Implicit within this process of choice and enrollment is the need for appropriate attention to specific factors influencing the choice of students in selecting an out-of-state graduate school. Although there have been many studies concerning undergraduate college attendance and a few concerning graduate and professional education, there has been

³Charles M. Grigg, Recruitment to Graduate Study, SREB Research Monograph No. 10 (Atlanta, 1965), pp. 31-32.

insufficient information provided about the factors associated with the decision of students to select a publicly supported graduate college outside their home state.

Statement of the Problem

As can be seen from the material in Table I (page 4), 1,743 full- and part-time non-Oklahoma graduate students attended public graduate colleges located in Oklahoma for the fall of 1968. Compared with 1,168 resident Oklahoma graduate students migrating to graduate colleges in states outside Oklahoma for the same period, the net in-migration of full- and part-time graduate students to Oklahoma was 575 students.

An examination of data related to the migration pattern of graduate students⁴ revealed that it is not an uncommon practice for students to leave their home state to attend a graduate institution in another state. This was of particular importance since graduate study opportunities were likely available to many of these students within their home state or other states. The broad problem from which the specific purpose of this study was derived is concerned with the migration of students at the graduate level and the factors which cause these students to seek a graduate education outside of their home state.

Oklahoma State University is one institution to which out-of-state students migrate to receive a graduate education. Oklahoma State University is a land-grant institution and a major center for graduate work in the Southwest. Master's degrees may be earned in 90 fields of

⁴United States Office of Education, Residence and Migration of College Students--Fall 1968: Basic State-To-State Matrix Table (Washington, 1970).

TABLE I

ALL FULL- AND PART-TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS MIGRATING
FROM OTHER STATES TO PUBLIC GRADUATE
COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

Fall 1968			
State	No.	State	No.
Alabama	26	Missouri	106
Alaska	3	Montana	8
Arizona	18	Nebraska	25
Arkansas	92	New Hampshire	0
California	76	New Jersey	33
Colorado	43	New Mexico	40
Connecticut	8	New York	87
Delaware	1	North Carolina	22
District of Columbia	3	Ohio	31
Florida	31	Oregon	10
Georgia	27	Pennsylvania	56
Hawaii	2	Rhode Island	5
Idaho	7	South Carolina	13
Illinois	78	South Dakota	22
Indiana	25	Tennessee	22
Iowa	33	Texas	306
Kansas	217	Utah	14
Kentucky	8	Vermont	5
Louisiana	64	Virginia	22
Maine	3	Washington	9
Maryland	13	West Virginia	6
Massachusetts	19	Wisconsin	35
Michigan	17	Wyoming	6
Minnesota	26	TOTAL	1,743
Mississippi	11		

Source: United States Office of Education, Residence and Migration of College Students--Fall 1968 (Washington, May, 1970).

study, the Specialist degree in 6 fields, and the Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education in 30 areas of study. The 1975 spring semester enrollment for the Oklahoma State University Graduate College was comprised of 518 international students, 529 non-Oklahoma students, and 2,178 resident Oklahoma students. This study dealt only with those non-Oklahoma graduate students who held United States citizenship.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold. First an attempt was made to identify those factors the entire population of 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students considered to be important in their decision to attend a graduate program at one specific Oklahoma institution, the Oklahoma State University.

The second purpose of this study was to identify by specifically designated categories of students those particular factors which a majority of members within these categories could agree as being of importance in choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate School.

Background and Value of the Study

The selection of a graduate school tends to be regionally restricted. In many cases, however, selection may also be dictated by particular institutional attributes.⁵ What are the reasons given by students for choice of school? This study was undertaken to add new data to the existing body of knowledge about factors non-resident

⁵Ibid.

students considered important in choosing to attend a publicly supported graduate college outside their home state, i.e., why non-Oklahoma students elected to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

The findings of this study may prove to be of value in two ways. First, many educators believe that out-of-state students are a distinct asset to the educational life of the campus. This is generally understood in the case of graduate studies.⁶ If out-of-state students are selected for intelligence and interest in learning, it is felt they can add a vital stimulus to the educational process through both the classroom setting and informal discussions which are important parts of graduate education. Thus, the overall educational enrichment of a university's program is believed to be enhanced by the enrollment of students from outside the state itself.⁷

Second, information obtained from this study may be of possible use to graduate faculty members and administrators in their recruitment work with out-of-state graduate students. The results of this study can have implications for the Oklahoma State University Graduate College in its efforts to attract qualified students to its various programs.

⁶Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Out-of-State Students in the West's Public Colleges and Universities (Boulder, Colorado, 1962), pp. 4-5.

⁷Ibid.

Assumptions

It was assumed that persons responding to the survey questionnaire were representative of the entire out-of-state graduate student population attending the Oklahoma State University Graduate College in the spring semester of 1975. It was further assumed that out-of-state graduate students were able to recall factors they considered decisive in their initial decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College and were able to respond to the questionnaire with candid truthfulness.

Limitations

The subjects of study were limited exclusively to citizens of the United States who were out-of-state graduate students attending the Oklahoma State University Graduate College during the spring semester of 1975.

The results of the study should be generalized only to those subjects included in this study. The investigation was a descriptive survey of the complete population of non-resident graduate students at a midwestern state university.

The findings of the study were limited to the number of questionnaires returned by the subjects. In an effort to keep the questionnaire objective in nature, some of the specificity may have been sacrificed in an attempt to make the instrument general enough to apply to all recipients. This limitation was minimized somewhat by adding "additional comments" items to which respondents were allowed to supplement any, or all, of the items.

Since studies of this nature are limited to a description of the data, this study did not attempt to deal with either prediction or causation.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are given to clarify terms used throughout the study.

Graduate College: a college, usually a major division of a university, that administers programs for degrees beyond the bachelor's and that may also have responsibility for administering research programs carried on by faculty members.

Public Graduate College: a graduate college under the control of public governmental agencies.

Graduate Student: a holder of at least a bachelor's degree who is enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College for the spring semester of 1975. This person holds United States citizenship.

Non-resident Student, Non-Oklahoma Student, and Out-of-State Student: a graduate student who is enrolled at Oklahoma State University, who is not a bona fide resident of the State of Oklahoma, as defined by the Oklahoma State University Catalog and who is required to pay an out-of-state tuition fee. This includes any student who is a recipient of a fellowship, scholarship, research assistantship and/or teaching assistantship. This person holds United States citizenship.

Home State: the state where the non-Oklahoma graduate student resided during the time of submitting a formal application for admission to the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

Summary

Generally speaking, the availability of graduate study opportunities exists for many students within their state of permanent residence. Yet, each year thousands of graduate students leave their home state to secure a graduate education in institutions of higher education located in states other than their own.

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, an attempt was made to identify those factors the entire population of non-Oklahoma graduate students indicated to be important in deciding to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. Second, an effort was made to identify by specifically designated categories of students those particular factors which a majority of members within these categories could agree as being of importance in choosing to attend this institution.

The entire population of non-Oklahoma graduate students enrolled in the spring semester of 1975 was surveyed by use of a mailed questionnaire. The research involved the computation and analysis of data secured from this population.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Prospective graduate students planning their future face a most critical decision--what institution of higher education should they attend? In finalizing the decision to continue graduate study, each student must select from one or more factors which will ultimately be the determinants upon which his choice of an institution will be based. The question is thus raised: upon what factors do graduate students base their decision to select a given institution offering graduate programs?

This study was concerned with the factors non-resident graduate students considered important in their decision to attend a midwestern graduate college located outside the boundary of their home state. A brief overview of literature related to the academic and socio-economic background of college students is given. Factors influencing the students' choice of college are traced. Here both general studies and studies relating specifically to the graduate and professional school student are presented. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the research findings in the area of choice of a graduate institution by graduate students.

Literature on Factors Influencing Students'

Choice of College

Numerous studies have been conducted concerning the academic, social, and economic backgrounds of college students in general. These studies and others of a similar nature have established a profile of the contemporary college student--how he performed on standard examinations, his parents' social status, his family's income, and other related factors.¹

General Studies

Systematic investigations directed toward identifying the specific factors which tend to influence students in their selection of a college give evidence of being limited in number. It may be concluded that research on the college student has not concentrated on determinants of why students choose to attend one institution of higher education as opposed to attending another institution. Commenting on this, Feldman and Newcomb concluded that

. . . the selection of a particular undergraduate institution is the outcome of a complex interaction of factors, which include the aspirations, abilities, and personality of the student; the values, goals, and socio-economic status of his parents; the direction or the influence of his friends, teachers, and other reference persons; the size, location, tuition costs, curriculum offerings, and other institutional characteristics of various colleges; and the

¹Listed are general works concerning the academic, social, and economic backgrounds of college students: e.g., Astin, 1965; Panos, 1966; Baird, 1967; Lloyd-Jones and Estin, 1967; Cross, 1968; Katz, et. al., 1968; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Hoyt, et. al., 1969; Baird, 1972.

image of these colleges held by the students and by those whose advice he seeks.²

Astin³ conducted a study to learn more about the characteristics of students at different institutions and to get some indication of how successful institutions were in attracting the kinds of students who could benefit most from their programs. Fifty-two variables were collected on 127,212 students representing the freshman classes of 248 institutions. These variables were factor analyzed into six student input factors (intellectualism, estheticism, status, leadership, pragmatism, and masculinity). Illustrative data correlates for the six factors were: Intellectualism--"High average grades in high school;" Estheticism--"High percentage of students who won literary awards;" Status--"High average socio-economic level of students' fathers;" Leadership--"High percentage of students who were elected to student offices in high school;" Pragmatism--"Low percentage of students planning social types of careers (for example, school teacher, nurse, social worker);" and Masculinity--"High percentage of male students."

Ten variables were then measured for 248 colleges. These included six classifications based on the proportion of baccalaureate degrees awarded in various fields (e.g., realistic orientation), size, percentage of males, operating budget, and selectivity. These variations were then correlated with the six student input factors.

The results of Astin's study of freshman input factors were as follows: 1) Intellectualism--High scores were associated with high

²Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore N. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students (San Francisco, 1969), p. 110.

³Alexander W. Astin, Who Goes Where to College (Chicago, 1965).

academic aptitude, especially mathematical and a high percentage of students pursuing science careers in the Ph. D. degrees; 2) Estheticism--high scores were associated with a high percentage of students who achieved in art and literature and who aspired to such careers; 3) Status--high scores were associated with a high percentage of students who came from high socio-economic backgrounds and aspired to careers in Enterprising fields (e.g., lawyers, executives); 4) Pragmatism--high scores were associated with a high percentage of students aspiring to Realistic fields (e.g., engineering, agriculture) and a low percentage of students aspiring to careers in social fields (e.g., teaching, sociology); and 5) Masculinity--high scores were associated with a high percentage of men, a high degree of students seeking professional degrees, and a low percentage of students aspiring to social fields.

According to Astin, then, diversity among students who entered different types of colleges appeared to be great. In general, "there appeared to be a relatively good fit between student and institutional characteristics."⁴

Richards and Holland,⁵ using American College Testing Program data, discovered four basic factors underlying 27 considerations of college choice for both males and females. The four basic dimensions were (1) intellectual emphasis, (2) practicality, (3) advice of others, and (4) social emphasis.

⁴Ibid., p. 49.

⁵James M. Richards, Jr. and John L. Holland, A Factor Analysis of Student "Explanations" of Their Choice of a College (Iowa City, Iowa, 1965).

Intellectual emphasis pertained to considerations of the quality of the faculty and scholastic standards, the type of curriculum, the intellectual atmosphere, and the reputation of the institution. Practicality was concerned with the desirability of location, distance from the student's residence, and cost factors. Advice of others, including high school teachers, parents, college alumni, and counselors at either the high school or the college represented another major area of influence. The fourth area of consideration related to the college's social climate, athletic programs, whether or not it was coeducational, and whether or not it has social organizations--fraternities and sororities.

On the basis of a series of studies sponsored through the National Merit Scholarship Program, Douvan and Kaye⁶ suggested that plans and concepts concerning college choice showed sex-specific orientations. Males tended to view college in terms of job preparation, whereas for females, college plans were not specifically tied to vocational goals. Two basic motivational types were considered: the student who had serious intellectual and academic goals, and the student who viewed college as a means for mobility. The choice of a school centered around three variables: (1) the criteria by which schools were judged; (2) the individuals or agencies that influenced the choice; and (3) the involvement of parents in the process.

The Douvan and Kaye study revealed the major criteria for choice of a school were (a) geographic criteria, (b) academic quality, (c)

⁶Elizabeth Douvan and Carol Kaye, "Motivational Factors in College Entrance," in Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York, 1963), pp. 199-224.

status-prestige, (d) cost, and (e) religion. Geographic criteria referred to local, regional, or national orientation. Academic quality referred to schools equipped to give the students the kind of high-quality training desired. Status-prestige referred to the students' choice of a "good school" which implied the school's social prestige as much as academic quality. Cost was important in that students very likely considered only those schools that met certain cost criteria. Religion as a factor seemed most likely for devout Catholic families and some of the more orthodox Protestant sects in choosing only those schools maintained by the religious group.

Commenting on the influence of individuals, agencies and parents in the process of college selection, Douvan and Kaye stated:

. . . Experienced counselors reported with some agreement that choice of college as well as the decision to go is influenced in particular cases by any or all of the following classes of individuals:

a. Parents, b. teachers, c. counselors, d. unrelated adult acquaintances, e. peers, f. close friends, and g. older siblings and their contemporaries.⁷

Nelson conducted a study in 1961 of the perceptions that 825 high school seniors in Los Angeles, California, held of the public and private institutions of higher learning in that State. One of his conclusions was

Of the 25 factors studied to determine their relative bearing upon students' choice of an institution, these were rated highest: variety of courses offered; academic standards; admissions requirements; reputation of the college; and reputation of a particular course of study. The factors judged least important were parking facilities, influence of friends, intercollegiate athletics, campus size, and sororities and fraternities.⁸

⁷Ibid., p. 221.

⁸James H. Nelson, "A Study of High School Seniors' Image of

Baird, in a 1967 study drawing a sample from the American College Testing Program, stated:

College represents many things to college-bound students: for many students of lower status backgrounds, college represents the path to social mobility; for other students, it is primarily a preparation for a vocation or profession; and for others, it represents a release from parental control.⁹

Considering these factors and being aware of the situation in which most students find themselves when arriving at a decision concerning choice of a college, it is evident that students from different social strata will give considerable weight to one or more of the areas of influence listed above.

. . . Not surprisingly, students from lower status backgrounds appear to be more likely than students of higher status backgrounds to focus on such things as tuition costs, location of the college, and other practical considerations. Higher status students are more likely than others to focus on the prestige of the school, its social facilities, and the quality of its teaching . . . high-ability students--particularly those either considering or actually about to enter high-quality colleges--primarily emphasize intellectual considerations. On the average, other students place less emphasis on considerations in this area. . . . Trent . . . concluded that "with the exception of a small minority who attended a few select institutions, most of the students picked their colleges first, for proximity; second, because of peer popularity; and third, out of a generally vague notion about the prestige of the institution."¹⁰

It may be concluded that a multiplicity of factors are influential, in varying degrees, in the students' choice of a college. "At present, however, we know little about what kinds of students entering what

California Colleges and Universities" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation abstract, The University of California at Los Angeles, 1961), p. 2.

⁹Leonard L. Baird, The Educational Goals of College Bound Youth (Iowa City, Iowa, 1967), p. 1.

¹⁰Feldman and Newcomb, pp. 112-113.

kinds of schools place major emphasis on which of these several considerations."¹¹

Graduate/Professional School Studies

Available research becomes more scarce regarding institutional selection by graduate students who enroll in higher education institutions. Either by choice or default, less attention has been given to investigating why one graduate college is selected in preference to another graduate college.

Gropper and Fitzpatrick,¹² using a sample of 3,581 undergraduate seniors, graduate students, and professional students from 35 schools, attempted to discover factors which influenced the decision of college seniors to continue their education in graduate or professional schools. Under the topic "Choice of School for Advanced Education," students were asked to rate the importance of eleven factors within five categories in making their selection of an institution of higher education. The five categories under which the eleven factors were listed were: (1) academic considerations, (2) financial considerations, (3) consideration of university environment, (4) consideration of personal objectives, and (5) consideration of information obtained about a university.

The conclusion reached by the authors was that students tended to choose schools on the basis of the academic status of the institutions. To quote the authors: "If students attempt to make their school choice

¹¹Ibid., p. 112.

¹²George L. Gropper and Robert Fitzpatrick, Who Goes to Graduate School? (Pittsburg, 1959), pp. 22-24.

on such rational grounds as the academic status of schools, as this study indicates, then this kind of information should be given to students who are trying to decide."¹³

In a study conducted by Charles Grigg,¹⁴ almost 6,000 collegiate graduates from 31 colleges and universities in 16 southern states were surveyed. Members of these collegiate graduating classes were first surveyed when they were seniors and again about nine months later after graduation. Students were asked to identify from a list of twelve factors the importance of each factor in making their decision to attend the graduate or professional school of their choice. The twelve factors, identified in order of importance, were as follows: (1) excellent training in field, (2) academic reputation, (3) will receive scholarship/fellowship, (4) cost, (5) nearness to home, (6) can meet admission requirements, (7) college teacher recommended, (8) family preference, (9) the school's graduates can make good contacts, (10) size of graduate or professional school, (11) friends or relatives in occupations I plan to enter recommended it, and (12) other (what?).

Grigg found that "excellent training in field of interest" was ranked highest by both male and female students. The reason cited second by males was "academic reputation," and the third was that they "received a scholarship or fellowship" from the institution. Women students listed scholarship or assistantship awards as the second most important reason. Other factors considered of less importance were

¹³Ibid., pp. 22, 24.

¹⁴Charles M. Grigg, Recruitment to Graduate Study (Atlanta, 1965), pp. 29-34.

cost, nearness to home, meeting admissions requirements, and recommended by college teachers.

Grigg pointed out an interesting aspect related to a hypothetical situation in which the most favorable conditions might exist under which male students would select a particular graduate school.

. . . He would choose that school with high academic reputation; one which would provide excellent training in a particular field, offer him a scholarship or assistantship, and which would be relatively inexpensive and near his home. This pattern of ideal conditions can seldom be met in practice. Can a student select an institution which has high academic standing and which at the same time minimizes the cost of higher education? The potential graduate student is caught on the horns of a dilemma. This is partly an explanation of why he would have to compromise between high academic reputation and cost. The compromise is reflected in the regional, often local selection of a graduate or professional school--choices reflecting priority of proximity and lower costs.¹⁵

The Educational Testing Service Corporation conducted two major studies dealing primarily with the postgraduate plans of college seniors. The first study by Leonard L. Baird (1973), The Graduate: A Report on the Characteristics and Plans of College Seniors,¹⁶ surveyed 21,000 seniors in 94 colleges and universities. A portion of this study dealt with reasons why students chose a particular department or school for graduate studies.

Students were asked to rate the importance of twenty-one factors in choosing a graduate or professional school. In order of student preference, the factors are listed as follows:

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 31-32.

¹⁶Leonard L. Baird, The Graduate: A Report of the Characteristics and Plans of College Seniors (Princeton, New Jersey, 1973), pp. 86-90.

1. High caliber of the program in my field
2. Prestige of institution
3. Excellent chance of being admitted
4. Friendly social climate
5. Reputation in research and research facilities
6. Desirable location--urban
7. Offer of financial assistance
8. Close to my home
9. Large department or professional school
10. Liberal racial attitudes
11. Reputation as a "teaching" school
13. As a resident of my state, I do not have to pay out-of-state tuition fees
13. Small department or professional school
15. Desirable location--suburban or rural
15. The chance to work under a particular faculty member
17. Advice of a teacher at another school
18. School has reputation of being active in social causes
19. Can earn a degree in a shorter time
20. Unstructured grading system
21. Church-related institution

Baird's findings revealed that the factor "high caliber of the program offered" as the most important in every field of study. According to the author, this indicated the students' concern for the quality of their education.

In summary Baird concluded:

. . . seniors who planned to go to graduate or professional schools give the greatest attention to the quality and prestige of the institutions they considered. The chances

of being admitted and the warmth of the institution were also important. Seniors gave little attention to such innovations as shorter degree programs and unstructured grading systems. There were many plausible differences between students who planned to study different fields, most relating to the distinct requirements of each field.¹⁷

The second major Educational Testing Service report by Baird (1974), *Careers and Curricula*,¹⁸ focused its attention primarily on the extent to which students followed through with their plans for attending graduate or professional school. This study was based on a follow-up of the national sample of 21,000 college students surveyed in 1973. A total of 7,112 students participated in this study.

A portion of this study dealt with the process of how graduate and professional school students made their decisions about which school to attend and what they regarded as helpful sources of information in making their choices. To a list of eleven factors categorized as "being helpful" in choosing a graduate or professional school, the students ranked the items in the following order.

1. Advice from friends or relatives
2. Directories or guides to graduate or professional study
3. Advice from the university department or school you applied to
4. Advice from a counselor at college
5. Visits to campuses
6. Advice from parents
7. Advice from a professional in the field (not a college professor)

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 89-90.

¹⁸Leonard L. Baird, Careers and Curricula (Princeton, New Jersey, 1974), pp. 46-49.

8. Advice from a graduate or professional school admissions office
9. Advice from a preprofessional advisor
10. Visit from someone recruiting for a school
11. Publications of national test programs such as Graduate Record Examination, Law School Aptitude Test or Medical College Aptitude Test.

From this study Baird drew the following conclusions:

. . . Looking back on their decisions, they regarded advice from friends and relatives as the most helpful source, followed by directories or guides to graduate study, advice from departments the student applied to and advice from a counselor at the undergraduate college. It is striking that a much larger percentage of the students considered the latter three as helpful sources of information when choosing a graduate or professional school than had considered the same sources to be important in making up their minds about plans for after graduation as seniors. It is also striking that students much less frequently regarded parents as helpful when choosing a school than they thought they were when planning for the future as seniors, . . . and that friends and relatives were considered more helpful than parents. Test program publications, visits from recruiters from schools, and advice from preprofessionals were not major factors in either choice. In some cases, students may have considered test program publications to be guides or directories.

The pattern of influence varied from field to field. The advice of counselors at the students' undergraduate college and advice from the school they applied to was helpful to all the students in graduate fields but advice from friends and relatives was relatively more helpful to students of the arts and humanities and social sciences. Directories or guides were relatively less helpful to students of arts and humanities than to other graduate students. Education students found the advice of friends, relatives, departments to which they applied, and information from directories most helpful.¹⁹

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 46-48.

Summary

Many factors appear to influence the graduate students' choice in selecting a particular graduate institution. Simply stated, the reasons for graduate students selecting the graduate college of their choice can presumably be placed into two categories--academic program considerations and/or "other" considerations. The former category would encompass such items as the quality of the institution's program, the prestige of the institution, and other items closely related to the academic emphasis. Key factors attributable to "other" considerations may be the student's belief that he has an excellent chance of being admitted, his selecting a graduate school near his place of permanent residence, and low cost. After reviewing the literature, one is inclined to agree with Grigg that the selection of a graduate institution by a prospective graduate student "represents the culmination of a complex process which is influenced by a large number of interacting factors."²⁰

Further research into the factors affecting the non-resident graduate students' choice in selecting a graduate school outside their home state boundaries was the intent of the current investigation. The procedures of this study are discussed in the following chapter.

²⁰Gregg, p. 52.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, an attempt was made to identify those factors the entire population of 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students considered to be important in their decision to attend a graduate program at the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. The second purpose was to identify by specifically designated categories of students those particular factors which a majority of members within these categories could agree as being of importance in choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University. This chapter will be devoted to the methodology used for accomplishing the objectives of this study and will be divided into the following sections: (1) Population, (2) Sample, (3) Instrumentation, (4) Data Collection, and (5) Analysis of Data.

Population

The population under study consisted of all non-Oklahoma students who were officially enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College for the spring semester of 1975. The population was identified from an enrollment list supplied by the Oklahoma State University Administrative Systems Development Office. This list consisted of those

graduate students who were classified as non-resident students and who were consequently required to pay the out-of-state fees which are assessed non-Oklahoma students, as defined by policy utilized by the University and implemented by the University's Bursar Office. Included in this group are non-Oklahoma graduate students who were recipients of fellowships, scholarships, research assistantships and/or teaching assistantships.

Five hundred and twenty-nine names of non-Oklahoma graduate students were obtained in this manner. Both names and current mailing addresses were supplied.

Sample

The selection of the sample is important to the research effort. Van Dalen, author of Understanding Educational Research, has this to say regarding sampling:

. . . No specific rules on how to obtain an adequate sample have been formulated, for each situation presents its own problems. If the phenomena under study are homogeneous, a small sample is sufficient.

He goes on to state that

. . . increasing the size of the sample is of little value if units are not chosen in a way that ensures representativeness of the sample. In general, three factors determine the size of an adequate sample: the nature of the population, the type of sample design, and the degree of precision desired. The researcher gives careful consideration to these factors and then selects the sampling design that will provide the desired precision at minimum cost.¹

¹Debold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York, 1966), p. 298.

This study group consisted of the entire population of 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students.

Instrumentation

The choice of the questionnaire in preference to other survey techniques is generally a matter of weighing its strengths and weaknesses against the interview approach. Speaking to this concept, Mouley² points out that one of the major advantages of the questionnaire is that it permits a wide coverage with the least expense of money and effort. Another advantage is that the replies may be more objective and accurate. If the respondent is permitted to remain anonymous, many times he will answer more candidly and objectively. A third advantage is that the questionnaire permits the respondent to consider the responses longer and gives him a chance to check the information he gives. It provides a greater uniformity to the manner in which the questions are presented to the respondent and should insure a more comparable answer. These advantages would increase the validity of the data gathered.

There are three major disadvantages of the questionnaire approach. These disadvantages are as follows: it does not permit the investigator to note the reluctance or evasiveness of the respondent; it does not permit the researcher to follow through on misunderstood questions; and there is the problem of unreturned questionnaires which decrease the size of the sample on which the results are based.

²George J. Mouley, The Science of Educational Research (New York, 1963), pp. 239-242.

Since the subjects of the population were residing both within and outside the State of Oklahoma, it appeared feasible to use a mail questionnaire for obtaining the necessary data.

The instrument formulated to gather the data for this study was a questionnaire developed primarily from a review of other questionnaire studies which were designed to identify factors undergraduate and graduate students considered important in the process of selecting an institution of higher education to attend. The questionnaire was revised and refined through recommendations from members of the doctoral committee, the Dean of the Oklahoma State University Graduate College, members of a doctoral seminar, and approximately twenty-five non-Oklahoma graduate students who were enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College during the 1974 fall semester. Those non-Oklahoma graduate students who assisted in the pilot group were later included in the population surveyed.³

The questionnaire was a printed four-page 8½ by 11 inch leaflet (see Appendix B). The participants were asked not to identify themselves, thus preserving their anonymity. However, each questionnaire was numerically coded to allow for follow-up coverage of the non-responding students. A statement in the cover letter (see Appendix A) noted this fact thus making each recipient aware of the coding.

According to the Direct Mail Advertising Association, the color combination of a brochure is important in giving maximum legibility and

³The assumption was made that since the responses were based on items related to a student's perception of his choice of a graduate school, previous exposure to the questionnaire would have minimal effect upon the validity of the information received from students participating in the pilot study.

visibility to the reader. It has been found that the color combination black on yellow yields maximum legibility and visibility.⁴ For this reason the combination of black on yellow was selected as the color combination for the questionnaire.

To gain a more comprehensive description of the non-Oklahoma graduate student, the development of the questionnaire was based upon suggestions made from the literature, the researcher's thesis advisor, members of the doctoral committee, and the Dean of the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. The first portion of the instrument was designed to secure demographic data on the non-Oklahoma graduate student population. Items included were: home state address; degree and major, age, sex, race, marital status, and number of children and their ages if respondents were married. Ten items related to identifying the three major sources of financial support were included. Each graduate student was asked to state what reason(s) he considered most important for pursuing his graduate studies.

A three-part section was designed to identify the process non-Oklahoma graduate students employed in choosing a graduate school. First, in deciding to attend a graduate school, students were asked to mark one of the following statements: if they purposefully eliminated considering graduate colleges within their home state; if they considered graduate colleges both within their home state and out-of-state; if they considered graduate colleges within their home state but considered Oklahoma State University as the only out-of-state college to attend. Second, students were asked to state why they chose to

⁴H. Kurt Vahle, "The Importance of Color in Advertising," Manual File 4050 (New York, ND).

attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College if they had been formally admitted to another graduate college. Third, students were asked whether the Oklahoma State University Graduate College was their first choice of a graduate college or whether the choice of Oklahoma State University was dictated by some other circumstances. Respondents were asked to identify these other circumstances.

Under the headings Institutional Factors, Economic Factors, Situational Factors, and Personal Factors, twenty-seven items were ordered along a five point continuum denoting the degree of consideration each factor played in the student's decision to attend the Oklahoma State University (OSU) Graduate College. Degrees of consideration represented were

- 1 if factor was a decisive consideration in choosing to attend OSU
- 2 if factor was a strong consideration
- 3 if factor was given consideration
- 4 if factor was given only slight consideration
- 5 if factor was not considered or not applicable

Respondents were asked to circle each item to denote the degree of consideration the factor played in the student's choice of Oklahoma State University. In the event a respondent failed to mark an item, it was assumed that the factor was not considered or was not applicable.

Each respondent was asked to list what he considered to be the three most important reasons for his choice of the department and/or graduate program at Oklahoma State University.

The questionnaire was designed to encourage written comments. It was hoped that provisions for additional comments would elicit

information the respondent considered important to his particular situation but which the questionnaire had omitted.

Data Collection

Of the list of 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students obtained from the Oklahoma State University Administrative Systems Development Office, only one person was not contacted due to the letter being returned as undeliverable. No appropriate address for this person could be located. Two of the persons on the list provided were considered inappropriate participants since both had been long-time residents of the State of Oklahoma. These two persons were charged the out-of-state fee since they were enrolled for dissertation credit while working outside the state boundary of Oklahoma. With this total of three people who were inappropriate to include in the population, the number of contacts with the population was assumed to be 526.

The original mailing of the 529 questionnaires on February 6, 1975, included an explanatory letter from Dr. Norman N. Durham, Dean of the Graduate College, a letter from the researcher, the questionnaire and a postage paid return envelope addressed to the researcher (see Appendix B for questionnaire and Appendix A for the correspondence).

On March 5, 1975, follow-up letters were sent to the one hundred and sixty remaining subjects who had failed to respond to the original questionnaire mailing. A second copy of the questionnaire, a stamped envelope, and a letter from the researcher were provided (see Appendix A).

Final contact by the researcher was attempted by telephone in an effort to reach non-responding participants of this study who had a

listed telephone number in Stillwater, Oklahoma, where Oklahoma State University is located. This telephone contact verified whether the participant received the questionnaire and whether he was willing to return it.

The questionnaires returned after the initial mailing amounted to 369 replies (69.9 percent) of the 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students thought to have been contacted. The returns to the follow-up mailing resulted in 38 replies (6.9 percent). Telephone contacts yielded 19 replies (3.7 percent). The total number of questionnaires returned was 426, resulting in an 80.5 percent return.

Analysis of Data

The greater portion of the data from these questionnaires were coded and punched on IBM cards for use in computer tabulation. The analysis of data was done through the expression of frequency and percentage distribution in tabular and descriptive form. A percentage and frequency count was used to describe the demographic data of the respondents.

The data gathered from the twenty-seven factors were presented in two forms. First, the numerical and percentage distribution of responses were presented for the entire responding population.

Second, inherent within the design of the instrument were natural categories by which respondents could be classified. A determination was made to focus specific attention toward specified categories and what respondents within these categories considered to be of greatest and least importance in making their decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

The selection of categories was based, in part, on a review of literature which indicated little or no attention having been given to these specified groups. Selection of categories was also based on an interview with the Dean of the Oklahoma State University Graduate College and in meeting with members of the doctoral committee. The latter two sources expressed concern for a need for specific information which a study of responses by students within these categories could provide.

Four specified categories were agreed upon. These categories were:

1. Respondents by Academic Degrees
2. Respondents by Graduate College Groups
3. Respondents by Geographic Areas
4. Respondents by Stipend Status

Pertinent data pertaining to categories other than those specified above would be given attention. Such information which was deemed appropriate to the purposes of this study, as determined by the researcher, will be presented in the narrative portion of this chapter.

Location of central tendency was of major concern in presenting the data of respondents within the specified categories. An attempt was made to identify by a simple majority responses to those individual factors which tended to cluster around the furthest two points on either end of the five point scale of measurement. This, then, was where the strongest attitude of respondents within specified categories would appear to lie. On the basis of this measure of central tendency (exceeding the fifty percent level), the strongest expressions of consideration would appear to lie in one of these furthest two points on either end of the scale: decisive or strong consideration, or slight

or no consideration.

Because studies of this nature are limited to a description of data, this study attempted neither prediction nor casuation as a goal.

Summary

This chapter has described the research method and procedure used in this study. The study instrument was a printed, four-page questionnaire covering seven areas: home state address, degree and major, personal information, financing education, reasons for graduate study, choosing a graduate college, and a list of twenty-seven factors denoting the degree of consideration these played in the non-Oklahoma students' decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

The study instrument was sent by mail to the entire population of non-Oklahoma graduate students enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College during the 1975 spring semester.

Statistical analysis of the descriptive data involved simple computation of frequency counts, percentages, and means.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to report the data gathered from the questionnaires sent to non-Oklahoma graduate students enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College for the spring semester of 1975. The findings will be presented in two sections. The first section will present an analysis of the data describing the non-Oklahoma graduate students: home-state, degree and major, personal information, financing education, reasons for graduate study, and choosing a graduate college. The second section contains the responses to a list of twenty-seven factors denoting the degree of consideration these factors played in the non-Oklahoma students' decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. An attempt was made to identify those factors the entire population of non-Oklahoma graduate students indicated to be important in deciding to attend this institution. An effort was then made to identify by specifically designated categories of students as to whether particular factors existed upon which a majority of members within these categories could agree as being of importance in choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

Description of Subjects

Distribution of the Respondents by States

In all the respondents represented 46 states. Only North Carolina, Nevada, and South Carolina were not represented in the population of non-Oklahoma graduate students. Non-resident students from states bordering Oklahoma (Arkansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, Missouri) comprised 41.3 percent (172) of the population with Texas and Kansas representing 13.1 percent (56) and 10.1 percent (43) respectively. Non-bordering states having the highest representation of non-Oklahoma graduate students were, in order, Louisiana, California, Illinois, New York, Mississippi, Florida, and Nebraska (see Table II).

Degrees and Majors of the Respondents

Information gathered in regard to degrees and majors showed that non-Oklahoma graduate students were enrolled in each of the nine degree programs offered by the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. Doctoral degree programs, including both the Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Education degrees, enrolled 51.5 percent of the respondents. The Master of Science degree programs included 38.0 percent of the population. In all, these three degree programs included 89.5 percent of the respondents in which non-Oklahoma graduate students were enrolled (see Table III).

There appeared to be an even distribution of respondents with respect to the fields of graduate study in which non-Oklahoma graduate students were enrolled. Of the 126 available fields of study, 99 were represented by the responding population. This represented 78.5 per-

TABLE II

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF ALL FULL- AND PART-TIME NON-OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE COLLEGE DURING THE 1975 SPRING SEMESTER

Region and State	Males <u>n</u>	Females <u>n</u>	Total <u>n</u>
1. BORDERING STATES			
Missouri	26	4	30
Kansas	32	11	43
Colorado	5	2	7
New Mexico	9	4	13
Arkansas	17	6	23
Texas	<u>41</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>56</u>
	130	42	172
2. NEW ENGLAND STATES			
Connecticut	3	1	4
Maine	2	0	2
Massachusetts	3	3	6
New Hampshire	1	0	1
Rhode Island	0	1	1
Vermont	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	10	5	15
3. SOUTHEAST STATES			
Alabama	10	1	11
Florida	9	2	11
Georgia	3	1	4
Kentucky	2	1	3
Louisiana	16	8	24
Virginia	5	2	7
North Carolina	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0
Tennessee	7	0	7
Mississippi	11	2	13
West Virginia	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	64	17	81
4. PLAINS STATES			
Iowa	5	0	5
Minnesota	4	1	5
Nebraska	7	4	11
North Dakota	4	1	5
South Dakota	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
	26	6	32

TABLE II (continued)

Region and State	Males <u>n</u>	Females <u>n</u>	Total <u>n</u>
5. FAR WEST STATES			
Akaska	3	1	4
Arizona	2	1	3
California	15	5	20
Nevada	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	1	1
Oregon	1	0	1
Washington	4	1	5
	25	9	34
6. ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES			
Idaho	1	1	2
Montana	1	0	1
Utah	1	0	1
Wyoming	1	0	1
	4	1	5
7. GREAT LAKES STATES			
Illinois	11	6	17
Indiana	6	3	9
Michigan	7	1	8
Ohio	6	0	6
Wisconsin	9	0	9
	39	10	49
8. MIDEAST STATES			
Delaware	1	1	2
Maryland	4	2	6
New Jersey	7	1	8
New York	13	2	15
Pennsylvania	6	1	7
	31	7	38
Total for All States	329	97	426

cent of all fields of study offered by the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. This ratio closely approximated the entire non-Oklahoma graduate student population fields of study ratio as reported by the Oklahoma State University Office of the Registrar: 104 of 126 fields of study represented (82.5 percent). Higher education (Ed.D.) attracted the largest number of non-Oklahoma graduate students with respect to a major field of study--36 (8.6 percent). Next in order were psychology (Ph.D.) with 21 (4.9 percent); food, nutrition, and institution management (M.S.) with 14 (3.2 percent); animal science (M.S.) with 13 (3.0 percent), and business administration (M.B.A.) with 12 (2.8 percent).

TABLE III

DEGREE PROGRAM IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE ENROLLED.

Degree	Males	Females	Total	
	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Masters of Arts	8	6	14	3.3
Master of Architecture	1	0	1	0.3
Master of Architecture Engineering	1	0	1	0.3
Master of Business Administration	10	1	11	2.6
Master of Engineering	13	0	13	3.0
Master of Science	103	59	162	38.0
Specialist of Education	1	0	1	0.3
Doctor of Education	62	12	74	17.3
Doctor of Philosophy	130	16	146	34.2
Enrolled as Special Student	0	3	3	0.7
Total	329	97	426	100.0

According to the Oklahoma State University Graduate College all fields of study in which graduate degrees may be earned are listed under five graduate college groups (see Appendix C). Data presented in Table IV shows the distribution of respondents within these five groups. The social sciences had the greatest representation of respondents, 126 (29.6 percent), while the humanities enrolled the fewest number of non-Oklahoma graduate students, 13 (3.1 percent).

TABLE IV
GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE ENROLLED

Group	Males	Females	Total	
	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Biological Sciences	61	19	80	18.7
2. Humanities	8	5	13	3.1
3. Physical Sciences and Engineering	91	10	101	23.7
4. Social Sciences	91	35	126	29.6
5. Teacher Education	78	28	106	24.9
Total	329	97	426	100.0

Personal Information of the Respondents

Data as to the age, sex, race, marital status and number of children of the respondents are presented in this section.

Age. Age does not seem to limit the quest for knowledge as respondents were represented in each of the six age categories. The

21-25 age category constituted the largest portion of non-Oklahoma graduate students by accounting for approximately 40 percent of the entire sample. The 26-30 age group contained 35.9 percent of the respondents, making this the second largest category. There was a definite tendency toward the enrollment of non-Oklahoma graduate students 35 years of age and under since 90.1 percent of all respondents were included within this category (See Table V.).

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE .

Age	Males	Females	Total	
	n	n	n	%
21-25	116	48	164	38.5
26-30	130	23	153	35.9
31-35	52	15	67	15.7
36-40	17	8	25	5.9
41-45	6	2	8	1.9
46+	8	0	8	1.9
No Response	0	1	1	0.2
Total	329	97	426	100.0

Sex. The sample consisted of 329 males (77.2 percent) and 97 females (22.8 percent). This ratio closely approximated the entire non-Oklahoma graduate student population male-female ratio as reported by the Oklahoma State University Office of the Registrar: 412 males (78.4 percent) and 114 females (21.6 percent).

Race. Of the 414 respondents specifying their race, 93.2 percent were Caucasian. Next in order were Blacks with 1.9 percent, Mexican-American with 0.9 percent, Orientals with 0.7 percent, and American Indians with 0.5 percent. Twelve (2.8 percent) of the respondents failed to indicate their racial origin.

Marital Status and Number of Children. Among the respondents, the percentage of married students was 59.6 percent compared with 38.3 percent who were single. Divorced students represented 2.1 percent of the responding population (See Table VI.).

Of the 262 married and divorced students, 140 (53.5 percent) reported having children while 122 (46.5 percent) indicated they had no children. Only three respondents had as many as 5 children, nine respondents had four children, thirteen had 3 children, sixty-seven had 2 children, and forty-eight had only 1 child. The mean number of children for these respondents was 1.94 children per family. The ages of the children ranged from less than one year to 33 years of age. The median age of all children was 4.9 years.

Personal Reasons for Pursuing Graduate Studies

Almost every respondent stated at least one reason for pursuing graduate studies, and many persons listed multiple reasons. As can be seen in Table VII, the leading reasons were "to qualify for a career (e.g., college teaching)," "to obtain a higher degree," and "to gain specialization and/or more competence in my chosen field of study." The sincerity of the reason(s) for pursuing graduate studies was apparent in the respondents' statements, such as:

TABLE VI
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS AND CHILDREN

	Males n	Females n	Total n	%
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	102	62	164	38.3
Married	223	30	253	59.6
Divorced	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2.1</u>
Total	329	97	426	100.0
CHILDREN				
Married and Divorced with No Children	97	25	122	46.5
Married and Divorced with Children	<u>130</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>53.5</u>
Total	227	35	262	100.0

I was not satisfied with my knowledge of accounting theory;
I felt I needed a higher level of study.

I wanted to continue teaching undergraduate mathematics and
I felt that my masters degree would not be competitive in
the job market in years to come, so I decided to obtain an
Ed.D.

I am pursuing graduate studies for purely academic and
educational reasons, that is, to pursue my own interest.

I want to remain abreast of educational developments and
innovations as well as to be more effective as an edu-
cational leader.

TABLE VII
REASONS FOR PURSUING GRADUATE STUDIES

Reason	Number*	Percent
To qualify for a career position (i.e., college teaching, psychologist, etc.)	106	19.5
To obtain a higher degree	94	17.3
To gain specialization and competence in chosen field of study	71	13.1
To prepare for another position	50	9.2
To prepare for a better job	42	7.7
Intellectual stimulation	37	6.8
To prepare for future advancement	32	5.8
Increase earning power	24	4.4
Advanced degree required in field of work	19	3.5
Personal satisfaction	18	3.3
To prepare for more satisfying employment	9	1.7
To fulfill life long ambition	9	1.7
Prestige of higher degree	8	1.5
Remain abreast in chosen field of study	8	1.5
"Other"	16	3.0
Total	543	100.0

*Number exceeds 426 because respondents could list as many reasons as applied.

Choosing A Graduate College

Inquiry into the process of choosing a graduate college included consideration non-Oklahoma graduate students gave to attending in-state or out-of-state institutions, reason(s) for selecting the Oklahoma State University Graduate College if the respondents had been formally admitted to a graduate college at other institutions, and whether Oklahoma State University was their first choice or dictated by some other circumstances. The findings of these topics follow.

Consideration Given to Attending In-State or Out-of-State Institutions. Among the respondents, 230 (54.0 percent) indicated they seriously considered attending graduate colleges both within their home state and out-of-state, while 132 (31.0 percent) said they eliminated seriously considering all graduate colleges within their home state. Forty-four (10.0 percent) indicated they seriously considered graduate colleges within their home state, but Oklahoma State University was the only out-of-state graduate college they gave serious consideration to attending. Of the 20 respondents (5.0 percent) failing to mark one of the above three categories, three stated Oklahoma State University was their only choice of a graduate college to attend.

Reasons for Choosing to Attend Oklahoma State University as Given by Respondents Who Were Formally Admitted to Graduate Programs at Other Institutions. In an open-ended inquiry, 327 respondents cited 358 reasons for attending the Oklahoma State University Graduate College in preference to attending graduate colleges of other institutions to which they had sought formal admittance. This would indicate that 76.7 per-

cent of the non-Oklahoma student respondents submitted a formal application to at least one other institution prior to enrollment in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. Of the 99 respondents who failed to answer this inquiry, 29 stated Oklahoma State University was the only institution to which they had made formal application for graduate study.

One factor, "offer of financial assistance," was reported to be of primary importance for attending Oklahoma State University in place of choosing to attend another institution to which respondents had been formally admitted. The priority accorded this and other factors can be seen in Table VIII.

Oklahoma State University as First or Dictated Choice. Of the 426 respondents, 144 (33.8 percent) judged Oklahoma State University to be their first choice of a graduate college, while 183 (42.5 percent) judged it to be a choice dictated by some other circumstances. Ninety-nine respondents (23.3 percent) failed to respond to this question.

Among the 183 non-Oklahoma graduate students who felt their choice was dictated by some other circumstances, 240 circumstances were registered on the questionnaires. The circumstances stated as dictating the choices were as follows: "offer of financial assistance," "type of program desired," "faculty member or major advisor encouraged me to attend," and "close proximity to home." Three of the more unusual reasons were:

Allowed me to work on my dissertation while working out of state. Maximum sabbatical for me was one year in which to finish the Ed.D. program. I would not be able to do this unless I completed a major portion of my dissertation while working full time.

Only school that would allow me some freedom of choosing courses in designing my degree program.

Because OSU had the better department. It had people known all over. I moved here alone and many miles from my home to attend this school. My friends thought I had lost my marbles. I am happy I came to OSU!!!

Table IX lists those circumstances respondents felt dictated their choice in deciding to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate School.

TABLE VIII

REASONS FOR CHOOSING TO ATTEND OSU AS GIVEN BY RESPONDENTS WHO WERE FORMALLY ADMITTED TO GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Reason	Number*	Percent
Offer of financial assistance	71	19.8
Quality of program and department	43	12.0
Type of program offered	37	10.3
Offer of assistantship, scholarship, or fellowship (no mention of financial assistance)	30	8.4
Faculty member or major advisor encouraged me to come	14	3.8
Warmth, friendliness, courtesy displayed	13	3.6
Geographic area or location	12	3.4
To study under a particular teacher	11	3.1
Good reputation of faculty	11	3.1
Close proximity to home	10	2.8
"Others"***	106	29.7
Total	358	100.0

*Total number based on 358 reasons stated by 327 respondents.

**The remaining 106 reasons were distributed among 31 individual categories of reasons. No category contained more than 2.5 percent of the total.

Factors Respondents Considered to Be Among the Three (3) Most Important Reasons for Their Selection of Department and/or Graduate Program at Oklahoma State University. In an open-ended inquiry, respondents were asked to list what they considered to be the three most important reasons for choosing to attend Oklahoma State University. All 426 respondents cited at least one reason. A total of 1,092 factors were listed. These factors were placed in 41 categories by the researcher for purposes of identification.

TABLE IX

REASONS FOR CHOOSING TO ATTEND OSU AS GIVEN BY RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED THEIR CHOICE WAS DICTATED BY SOME OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES

Reason	Number*	Percent
Offer of financial assistance	85	35.4
Type of program offered	18	7.5
Offer of assistantship, scholarship or fellowship (no mention of financial assistance)	16	6.2
Faculty member or major advisor encouraged me to come	11	4.6
Close proximity to home	10	4.2
Quality of program and department	9	3.8
Could gain admittance	9	3.8
Spouse attending OSU	9	3.8
Research opportunities and/or facilities	7	2.9
"Other"***	66	27.8
Total	240	100.0

*Total number based on 240 reasons stated by 183 respondents.

**The remaining 66 reasons were distributed among 32 individual categories of reasons. No category contained more than 2.5 percent of the total.

Three factors emerged as the most important reasons for the students' selection of Oklahoma State University. Those factors were: "quality of program and department"; "offer of financial assistance"; and "type of program offered." The priority accorded these and other factors can be seen in Table X.

TABLE X
FACTORS RESPONDENTS CONSIDERED TO BE AMONG THE THREE MOST
IMPORTANT REASONS FOR THEIR SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT
AND/OR GRADUATE PROGRAM AT OSU

	Number*	Percent
Quality of program and department	138	12.7
Offer of financial assistance	135	12.4
Type of program offered		10.0
Offer of assistantship, scholarship, or fellowship (no mention of financial assistance)	54	4.9
Good reputation of faculty	50	4.6
Recommended by former college teacher	48	4.4
Close proximity to home	46	4.2
Faculty member or major advisor encouraged me to attend	42	3.8
Geographic area or location	34	3.1
Research opportunities and/or facilities	31	2.8
Quick response to inquiry, speed of admittance impressed with correspondence and communications	28	2.6
Maximum flexibility within program of study	28	2.6
To study under a particular teacher	25	2.5
"Other" **	325	29.4
Total	1,092	100.0

*Total number based on 1,092 factors stated by 426 respondents.

**The remaining 355 factors were distributed among 28 individual categories of factors. No category contained more than 2.5 percent of the total.

Financing Education

Income to meet the expenses of a graduate education was of concern to this study. Attention was given to stipend recipients; primary, secondary, and tertiary sources of income for all respondents; primary sources of financial support for all respondents based on sex, marital status, and children; and primary sources of support for non-stipend recipients. The findings of these topics follows.

Stipend Recipients. When respondents were asked to identify the means by which they financed their graduate study, 329 (77.4 percent) of the 426 respondents indicated they held some form of stipend (scholarship, fellowship, teaching or research assistantship). The survey findings closely approximated the percentage of the total non-Oklahoma graduate student population receiving stipends: 398 (75.8 percent) of the 526 non-Oklahoma graduate student population.¹

The distribution of stipend awards by geographic regions is presented in Table XI. Of the 329 stipends granted, the largest number of stipends were awarded to non-Oklahoma students from states bordering Oklahoma: 130 (39.5 percent).

Attention was next given to the distribution of stipend awards within the five graduate college groups. Students enrolled in the social sciences, and the physical sciences and engineering held the greatest number of stipends: social sciences--96 (29.2 percent); physical sciences and engineering--79 (24.0 percent) (See Table XII.).

¹This is in contrast to 23.5 percent (512 of 2,178) of the Oklahoma graduate students who receive stipend awards at this institution.

TABLE XI
DISTRIBUTION OF STIPEND AWARDS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

Region	Males	Females	Total	
	n	n	n	%
1. Bordering States	100	30	130	39.5
2. New England States	8	2	10	3.0
3. Southeast States	52	11	63	19.1
4. Plains States	23	5	28	8.5
5. Far West States	20	5	25	7.6
6. Rocky Mountain States	3	1	4	1.2
7. Great Lakes States	33	7	40	12.2
8. Mideast States	24	5	29	8.9
Total	263	66	329	100.0

TABLE XII
DISTRIBUTION OF STIPEND AWARDS BY GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS

Group	Males	Females	Total	
	n	n	n	%
1. Biological Sciences	56	12	68	20.7
2. Humanities	8	3	11	3.3
3. Physical Sciences and Engineering	70	9	79	24.0
4. Social Sciences	73	23	96	29.2
5. Teacher Education	56	19	75	22.8
Total	263	66	329	100.0

The distribution of stipend awards with respect to the recipients' sex, marital status, children, age, and academic degree was next given attention. Of the 329 respondents holding stipends, 263 (80.0 percent) were males while 66 (20.0 percent) females were recipients of such financial assistance. Differences in marital status and age were reflected in the persons to whom stipends were awarded. There appeared to be an inverse proportion of stipends awarded to males and females with respect to marital status. Of the 263 male stipend recipients, 183 (69.6 percent) were married while 80 (30.4 percent) were single. In contrast to males, 43 (65.1 percent) of the 66 female recipients were single. Among the combined male and female stipend recipients, 247 (75.2 percent) were 30 years of age or younger (See Table XIII.).

Among the 263 male stipend recipients, 162 (61.7 percent) were enrolled in doctoral level studies while 101 (38.3 percent) were engaged in graduate study at the Master's level. For female stipend holders, the opposite held true. Forty-four (66.7 percent) of the women were engaged in study at the Master's level while 22 (33.3 percent) were pursuing the doctorate (See Table XIII.).

Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Sources of Income for All Respondents. Each student receiving a questionnaire was asked to identify his three (3) major sources of financial support. From a list of ten (10) items, the student was requested to rank three major sources and to estimate the percentage of each source in relation to his total financial income. In estimating the amount of income, it was unnecessary that the percentages listed equal 100 percent.

Of the 426 questionnaires, 45 (10.5 percent) were judged to be invalid since the respondents failed to distinguish clearly which items

they considered to be primary, secondary, or tertiary sources of financial support. Among the 381 valid answers to this portion of the questionnaire, 293 (76.9 percent) were recipients of stipend awards, while 88 (23.1 percent) received no stipend award.

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF STIPEND AWARDS BY SEX, MARITAL STATUS, CHILDREN, AGE, AND DEGREE

	Males		Females		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Number	263	80.0	66	20.0	329	100.0
Marital Status*						
Single	80	30.4	43	65.1	123	37.2
Married	183	69.6	23	34.9	206	62.8
No Children	80	43.6	17	73.9	96	46.8
Children	103	56.4	6	26.1	110	53.2
Age						
21-25	109	41.7	37	56.0	146	44.6
26-30	90	34.0	11	16.7	101	30.6
31-35	40	15.1	12	18.1	52	15.8
36-40	15	5.7	5	7.6	20	6.0
41-45	5	1.9	0		5	1.5
46+	4	1.6	1	1.6	5	1.5
Degree						
Doctors	162	61.7	22	33.3	184	56.0
Masters	101	38.3	44	66.7	145	44.0

*Three divorced persons (2 females and 1 male) included as married with no children.

Numbered among the valid responses, 50 (13.1 percent) listed only one major source of financial support, 126 (33.0 percent) listed two major sources of income, while 205 (53.9 percent) identified as many as three major sources from which they received financial support.

Among primary sources of income from all valid responses, stipend awards was the one item most commonly listed: 48.3 percent. Other primary sources listed in order were: spouse (18.8 percent); other-e.g., G.I. Bill, etc., (8.2 percent); savings (7.3 percent); parents (6.0 percent); own employment (4.3 percent); paid by non-college employer (3.0 percent); loans (2.8 percent); and paid sabbatical leave (2.0 percent).

Secondary sources of income for all respondents exhibited a pattern similar to that found among primary sources. Stipend awards were listed as being the most important secondary source of income, followed in order by spouse, savings, own employment, parents, other-e.g., G.I. Bill, etc., loan, paid sabbatical leave, and paid by non-college employer.

Tertiary sources of income for all respondents reflected a change in the pattern of items from which sources of income were secured. The major tertiary source of income was savings. This was followed in order by parents, loans, stipends, spouse, own employment, others-e.g., G.I. Bill, etc., paid by non-college employer, and paid sabbatical leave.

Primary Sources of Financial Support for All Respondents Based on Sex, Marital Status, and Children. Attention was next directed to the various subgroups of the responding population and to what members within these subgroups considered to be their primary sources of income.

Sex: Males listed in order what they considered to be their three primary sources of income. These sources were: stipend, spouse; and others-e.g., G.I. Bill, etc. Females listed in order what they considered to be their three primary sources of income. These sources were: stipend; spouse; and savings.

Marital Status: Single male and female students listed in order their three primary sources of income. These sources were: stipend; parents; and savings. Married male students ranked as their three primary sources of income: stipend, spouse, others-i.e., G.I. Bill, etc. Married female students differed from married males in only one area. For married females savings was the third primary source of income. Since only three divorced students submitted valid questionnaire answers to this item, their responses were omitted.

Children: Married students without children ranked stipend, spouse, and parents as their primary sources of income. Married students with children listed stipend as the most important primary source of income. However, in contrast to those without children, married students with children ranked other-e.g., G.I. Bill, etc., the second most important primary source of income, and spouse as the third most important source. Divorced persons were not included within this group.

Primary Sources of Financial Support for Non-Stipend Recipients.
Only 97 (22.6 percent) of the 426 non-Oklahoma graduate students were not recipients of a stipend award. Of the 381 questionnaires, 88 (23.7 percent) reported receiving no stipend. From responses, the following items were ranked as the three most important primary sources of

income for non-stipend recipients: spouse; savings; and own employment. Other primary sources in order were: parents; being paid by non-college employers; other-e.g., G.I. Bill, etc.; paid sabbatical leave; and loans.

Since the sample size of non-stipend recipients was relatively small, it was feasible to identify primary sources of financial support based on sex, marital status, and children.

Analysis of Factors

Analysis Covering All Respondents

The second portion of the survey questionnaire was divided into sections of twenty-seven factors. Survey participants were asked to indicate those factors which they considered to be influential in their choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. The section Institutional included factors such as unavailability of specific course of study at other institutions, academic reputation of department, faculty-student rapport, and importance of correspondence. The Economic section dealt with those factors pertaining to overall costs, financial assistance received, and employment opportunities while in school. The section entitled Situational considered factors such as meeting admission requirements, advice from former teachers, and recruitment activities. The fourth section, Personal, included those factors that reflected individual interest and desires but had little or nothing to do with the quality of the academic program, professional advice, or extenuating circumstances.

Because the four sections contained unequal numbers of factors,

and since value weights were not assigned to individual factors, no comparison was made between sections of factors. The primary reason for placing individual factors within separate sections was to facilitate the presentation of factors in the survey questionnaire.

Tables XIV through XVII list the number and percentage distribution of responses to the four sections of factors. Based on data presented in these tables, certain factors emerged as being either important or unimportant in the students' decisions to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. For purposes of simplicity of presentation, the overall distribution of responses to factors listed in Tables XIV through XVII will be presented in four subgroups. The subgroups consist of points located on the scale used to measure the degree of consideration students gave to these various factors in choosing to attend Oklahoma State University. The ten (10)² most frequently cited factors will be ranked within the following subgroups: (1) "decisive consideration" only; (2) "decisive consideration" combined with "strong consideration;" (3) "no consideration" only; and (4) "no consideration" combined with "slight consideration."

Factors Ranked by Decisive Consideration Only. Of the 426 respondents, 29.6 percent indicated "financial assistance" as the leading factor to which decisive consideration was given in the students' decision to attend Oklahoma State University. The only other factor in this subgroup which exceeded the twenty percent level was "importance

²The selection of ten factors was strictly an arbitrary number. The list was used merely as a way to compare level of responses. The use of such a list is not intended to give the impression that factors within one list of ten are considered to be of the same importance as factors within another list of ten.

TABLE XIV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

Institutional Factors	Decisive Consid.		Strong Consid.		Given Consid.		Slight Consid.		No Consid.		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Prestige of OSU	15	3.5	76	17.8	126	29.6	81	19.0	128	30.0	426	100.0
2. Program not offered elsewhere	47	11.0	55	12.9	52	12.2	46	10.8	226	53.1	426	100.0
3. Better program	78	18.3	110	25.8	84	19.7	47	11.0	107	25.1	426	100.0
4. Academic reputation	58	13.6	115	27.0	125	29.3	43	10.1	85	20.0	426	100.0
5. Educational-research opportunities	65	15.3	99	23.2	120	28.2	59	13.8	83	19.5	426	100.0
6. Faculty-student rapport	72	16.9	76	17.8	85	20.0	50	11.7	143	33.6	426	100.0
7. Prompt notification of acceptance	59	13.8	75	17.6	66	15.5	63	14.8	163	38.3	426	100.0
8. Acceptance of transfer credit	38	8.9	45	10.6	48	11.3	37	8.7	258	60.6	426	100.0
9. Importance of correspondence	105	24.6	123	28.9	77	18.1	42	9.9	79	18.5	426	100.0

TABLE XV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO ECONOMIC FACTORS

Economic Factors	Decisive Consid.		Strong Consid.		Given Consid.		Slight Consid.		No Consid.		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Overall cost less	37	8.7	43	10.1	77	18.1	73	17.1	196	46.0	426	100.0
2. Tuition cost less	27	6.3	43	10.1	68	16.0	86	20.2	202	47.4	426	100.0
3. Financial assistance more than from other schools	126	29.6	57	13.4	36	8.5	37	8.7	170	39.9	426	100.0
4. Employment oppor- tunities for spouse or self	65	15.3	56	13.1	48	11.3	47	11.0	210	49.3	426	100.0

TABLE XVI

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Situational Factors	Decisive Consid.		Strong Consid.		Given Consid.		Slight Consid.		No Consid.		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Could gain admittance	75	17.6	68	16.0	98	23.0	59	13.8	126	29.6	426	100.0
2. Recommended by college teachers	70	16.4	78	18.3	65	15.3	40	9.4	173	40.6	426	100.0
3. Recommended by colleagues	43	10.1	72	16.9	55	12.9	57	13.4	199	46.7	426	100.0
4. Discussion with faculty-students	79	18.5	80	18.8	76	17.8	46	10.8	145	34.0	426	100.0
5. Recruitment effort	35	8.2	32	7.5	37	8.7	31	7.3	291	68.3	426	100.0
6. Departmental brochure	18	4.2	24	5.6	49	11.5	49	11.5	286	67.1	426	100.0
7. Directors information	31	7.3	44	10.3	59	13.8	59	13.8	233	54.7	426	100.0

TABLE XVII

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal Factors	Decisive Consid.		Strong Consid.		Given Consid.		Slight Consid.		No Consid.		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Sought a non-localized educational experience	81	19.0	83	19.5	61	14.3	38	8.9	163	38.3	426	100.0
2. To secure employment in Southwest after graduation	47	11.0	56	13.1	48	11.3	41	9.6	234	54.9	426	100.0
3. Proximity to home	52	12.2	42	9.9	55	12.9	34	8.0	243	57.0	426	100.0
4. Had degree from OSU-- felt at home	31	7.3	8	1.9	9	2.1	5	1.2	373	87.6	426	100.0
5. Recommended by friends-acquaintances	72	16.9	77	18.1	80	18.8	50	11.7	147	34.5	426	100.0
6. Recommended by parents-relatives	12	2.8	14	3.3	25	5.9	24	5.6	351	82.4	426	100.0
7. Non-academic features	31	7.3	52	12.4	72	16.9	44	10.3	227	53.3	426	100.0

of correspondence" (24.6 percent). The three factors which registered the next largest percentage of responses were: "sought a non-localized educational experience" (19.0 percent); "discussion with faculty-students" (18.5 percent); and "better program" (18.3 percent). The five remaining factors receiving the greatest number of decisive consideration responses were: "could gain admittance" (17.6 percent); "faculty-student rapport" (16.9 percent); "recommended by friends-acquaintances" (16.9 percent); "recommended by college teachers" (16.4 percent); and "educational-research opportunities" and "employment opportunities for spouse or self" each tallied 15.3 percent of the responses to decisive consideration.

Factors Ranked by Combining Decisive Consideration With Strong Consideration. When the two points of the measurement scale--decisive consideration and strong consideration--were combined, a difference in the pattern of factors emerged. "Importance of correspondence" was the only factor exceeding the fifty percent level (53.5 percent) within this subgroup. Three factors received above a forty percent response: "better program" (44.1 percent); "financial assistance" (43.0 percent); and "academic reputation" (40.6 percent). The six remaining factors which indicated decisive and strong consideration exceeded the thirty percent response level. These factors were: "educational-research opportunities" and "sought a non-localized educational experience" (38.5 percent each); "discussion with faculty-students" (37.3 percent); "recommended by friends-acquaintances" (35.0 percent); "recommended by college teachers" (34.7 percent); and "faculty-student rapport" (34.7 percent).

Factors Ranked by No Consideration Only. The data in Table XIV through XVII revealed a number of factors to which respondents indicated no consideration was given in their decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. Approximately 88 percent of the respondents listed "had degree from OSU-felt at home" as the factor to which the least consideration was given. The only other factor within this subgroup which exceeded the 80 percent response level was "recommended by parents-relatives" (82.4 percent). Three factors received a sixty percent response of above: "recruitment effort" (68.3 percent); "departmental brochure" (67.1 percent); and "acceptance of transfer credit" (60.6 percent). The five remaining factors which indicated no consideration exceeded the fifty percent level. These factors were: "proximity to home" (57.0 percent); "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," (54.9 percent); "directory information" (54.7 percent); "non-academic features" (53.3 percent); and "program not offered elsewhere" (53.1 percent).

Factors Ranked by Combining No Consideration With Slight Consideration. In combining the two points of the measurement scale--'no consideration' and 'slight consideration'--only a slight variation in the pattern by which factors were ranked emerged. The first five factors in this subgroup corresponded closely to the first five factors in the subgroup "no consideration only." These five factors were: "had degree from OSU-felt at home" (88.8 percent); "recommended by parents-relatives" (88.0 percent); "departmental brochure" (78.6 percent); "recruitment effort" (75.6 percent); and "acceptance of transfer credit" (69.3 percent). Four of the five remaining factors in this subgroup appeared in the subgroup "no consideration" only. The factor "tuition

cost less" in this subgroup replaced the factor "non-academic features" in the subgroup "no consideration" only. The five factors which constituted the remainder of this subgroup were "directory information" (68.5 percent); "tuition cost less" (67.6 percent); "proximity to home" (65.0 percent); "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation" (64.5 percent); and "program not offered elsewhere" (63.9 percent).

In addition to these ten factors, five more factors exceeded the fifty percent level of response suggesting that there was a greater degree of importance to no or slight consideration than might be inferred by merely listing the top ten factors. These additional five factors were: "non-academic features" (63.6 percent); "overall cost less" (63.1 percent); "employment opportunities for spouse or self" (60.3 percent); "recommended by colleagues" (60.1 percent); and "prompt notification of acceptance" (53.1 percent).

Analysis Covering Specified Categories³ of Respondents

Within the design of the survey instrument were specified categories of respondents to which particular attention was directed. An attempt was made to identify by a simple majority of responses whether or not there existed individual factors which members within these

³For purposes of clarity the following terminology will be used in the remainder of this study. The term specified categories refers to respondents by academic degrees, graduate college groups, geographic areas, and stipend status. The term groups refers to respondents within a specified category: i.e., doctoral and masters degree groups, stipend and non-stipend groups. The term section refers to the four sets of factors: Institutional, Economic, Situational, and Personal. The term scale refers to the five point scale by which respondents were asked to rank the twenty-seven factors in relation to the degree of consideration the factor played in their choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

or not there existed individual factors which members within these specified categories considered to be important in their decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

The selection of these specified categories for study was determined by the Dean of the Oklahoma State University Graduate College, members of the doctoral committee, and the researcher. The four specified categories to which attention was focused were: (1) respondents by academic degrees; (2) respondents by graduate college groups; (3) respondents by geographic areas; and (4) respondents by stipend status. The results of these findings are presented in the following paragraphs.

Responses to Factors by Academic Degrees. For purposes of presentation all respondents were placed into two degree groups: doctoral and Masters. Of the 426 respondents, 220 were classified as doctoral degree students and 203 as Master degree students. The one person enrolled in the specialist of education degree program was listed with the Masters degree students. The three students enrolled as special students were omitted from the survey. The results of responses given by respondents in the academic degree groups can be seen in Tables XVIII through XXI.

Under the Institutional section, the only factor to which a majority of both doctoral and Masters students indicated as having been given decisive or strong consideration was "importance of correspondence." Both doctoral and Master students agreed on three institutional factors to which slight or no consideration was given. These three factors were: "program not offered elsewhere," "prompt notification of acceptance," and "acceptance of transfer credits."

Under the Economic, Situational, and Personal sections, neither doctoral or Masters degree students identified factors as having been given decisive or strong consideration in the decision to attend Oklahoma State University.

TABLE XVIII

IDENTIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEGREE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

Institutional Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Prestige of OSU		
2. Program not offered elsewhere		1,2
3. Better program		
4. Academic reputation		
5. Educational-research opportunities		
6. Faculty-student rapport		
7. Prompt notification of acceptance		1,2
8. Acceptance of transfer credits		1,2
9. Importance of correspondence	1,2	

1 = Doctors Degree; 2 = Masters Degree

Factors within the Economic section to which respondents in both degree groups indicated as having been given slight or no consideration were: "overall cost less," "tuition level less," and "employment opportunities for spouse or self." Under the Situational section, respondents in both degree groups cited the following four factors as having been given slight or no consideration: "recommended by colleagues," "recruitment effort," "departmental brochure," and "directory information."

TABLE XIX

IDENTIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEGREE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR ECONOMIC FACTORS

Economic Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Overall cost less		1,2
2. Tuition level less		1,2
3. Financial assistance more than from other schools.		
4. Employment opportunities for spouse or self		1,2

1 = Doctors Degree; 2 = Masters Degree

Under the section Personal, only the doctoral degree group indicated the factor "sought a non-localized educational experience" as having been given slight or no consideration. "Recommended by friends-acquaintances" was the only factor to which neither degree group indicated as having been given slight or no consideration. All other factors in this category were marked slight or no consideration by a majority of respondents in both degree groups.

TABLE XX

IDENTIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEGREE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Situational Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Could gain admittance		
2. Recommended by college teachers		
3. Recommended by colleagues		1,2
4. Discussion with faculty-students		
5. Recruitment effort		1,2
6. Departmental brochure		1,2
7. Directory information		1,2

1 = Doctors Degree; 2 = Masters Degree

TABLE XXI

IDENTIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEGREE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Sought a non-localized educational experience		1
2. To secure employment in Southwest after graduation		1,2
3. Proximity to home		1,2
4. Had degree from OSU-felt at home		1,2
5. Recommended by friends-acquaintances		
6. Recommended by parents-relatives		1,2
7. Non-academic features		1,2

1 = Doctors Degree; 2 = Masters Degree

Although neither group of degree respondents identified the factor "could gain admittance" as having been of decisive or strong consideration, the responses to this factor on the questionnaires revealed one interesting fact. Special attention was drawn to the 21 persons enrolled in psychology at the doctoral level. Of these persons, all 21 marked the factor "could gain admittance" as having been given either decisive or strong consideration. Numerous comments were made by respondents in this field of study concerning the importance this factor played in their decision to attend this institution. One comment on a returned survey questionnaire stated:

. . . The competition for admissions in my area is so tough that you apply and welcome any acceptance. OSU has a newly approved clinical psychology program which is what I wanted. Things have worked out well and I consider my present position to be very good.

Responses to Factors by Graduate College Groups. According to the Oklahoma State University Graduate College all fields of study in which graduate degrees may be earned are listed under five graduate college groups. (See Appendix C.) Data in Table IV indicate the number of responding students within each group.⁴ The results of responses to the twenty-seven factors by respondents within these five groups may be seen in Tables XXII through XXV.

Under the section Institutional there were three factors to which respondents in at least one group gave decisive or strong consideration. Teacher Education respondents listed the factor "better program" to which they gave decisive or strong consideration. Respondents

⁴The reader should note the small size of respondents within the Humanities Group (See Table IV, p. 39.).

TABLE XXII

IDENTIFICATION OF GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER
DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO
CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING
FIFTY PERCENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

Institutional Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Prestige of OSU		3,4
2. Program not offered elsewhere		All Groups
3. Better program	5	
4. Academic reputation		
5. Educational-research opportunities	1	
6. Faculty-student rapport		1,3
7. Prompt notification of acceptance		1,2,3,4
8. Acceptance of transfer credits		1,2,3,4
9. Importance of correspondence	2,4,5	

1 = Biological Sciences; 2 = Humanities; 3 = Physical Sciences and Engineering; 4 = Social Sciences; 5 = Teacher Education

in the Biological Sciences indicated "educational-research opportunities" as being the factor to which they gave decisive or strong consideration. A majority of the respondents within the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Teacher Education cited "importance of correspondence" as the factor to which decisive or strong consideration was given in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University. No trend of agreement was indicated for four factors within the slight or no consideration scale by any of the respondents within the five groups. These four factors were: "better program," "academic reputation," "educational-research opportunities," and "importance of correspondence."

TABLE XXIII

IDENTIFICATION OF GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR ECONOMIC FACTORS

Economic Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Overall cost less		1,3,4,5
2. Tuition level less		All Groups
3. Financial assistance more than from other schools		1,3
4. Employment opportunities for spouse or self		All Groups

1 = Biological Sciences; 2 = Humanities; 3 = Physical Sciences and Engineering; 4 = Social Sciences; 5 = Teacher Education

Under the sections Economic, Situational, and Personal, only one factor by respondents within one group was given decisive or strong consideration. Biological Science respondents indicated the factor "sought a non-localized educational experience" as being of importance in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University. Within these same three sections (Economic, Situational, and Personal) all factors were represented on the slight or no consideration scale by respondents in at least one of the graduate college groups.

TABLE XXIV

IDENTIFICATION OF GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Situational Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Could gain admittance		3
2. Recommended by college teachers		2,3,5
3. Recommended by colleagues		All Groups
4. Discussion with faculty-students		4
5. Recruitment effort		All Groups
6. Departmental brochure		All Groups
7. Directory information		All Groups

1 = Biological Sciences; 2 = Humanities; 3 = Physical Sciences and Engineering; 4 = Social Sciences; 5 = Teacher Education

TABLE XXV

IDENTIFICATION OF GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS INDICATING EITHER
DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO
CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING
FIFTY PERCENT FOR PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Sought a non-localized educational experience	1	3,4
2. To secure employment in Southwest after graduation		All Groups
3. Proximity to home		All Groups
4. Had degree from OSU-felt at home		All Groups
5. Recommended by friends-acquaintances		2,3
6. Recommended by parents-relatives		All Groups
7. Non-academic features		All Groups

1 = Biological Sciences; 2 = Humanities; 3 = Physical Sciences and Engineering; 4 = Social Sciences; 5 = Teacher Education

One point of interest was noted regarding the responses by respondents in the Teacher Education group. Of the 30 persons enrolled in the field of study, higher education--Ed.D., 25 marked the factor "better program" as a decisive consideration and 3 marked it as strong consideration on the scale of consideration. Of these 30, 16 respondents wrote additional comments related to the quality or uniqueness of the higher education program at the doctoral level. One comment received stated:

. . . OSU had the only program in which I could earn an Ed.D. in my field of specialization . . . geography. This program seemed to be unique in relation to other graduate programs I considered.

Responses to Factors by Geographic Regions. The distribution of respondents by geographic regions can be seen from the data presented in Table II.⁵ The results of responses to factors by students within the geographic regions are presented in data on Tables XXVI through XXIX.

In the Institutional section, the one factor to which the most decisive or strong consideration responses were registered by the largest number of respondents by regions was "importance of correspondence." Respondents from four regions so identified this factor. Other factors under the Institutional Section for which decisive or strong considerations were received were: "program not offered elsewhere," "better program," "academic reputation," and "educational-research opportunities." No trend of agreement was indicated for four factors within the slight or no consideration scale by respondents within any of the eight

⁵The reader should note the small size of respondents within the various geographic groups (See Table II, pp. 36-37.).

regions. These four factors were: "better program," "academic reputation," "educational-research opportunities," and "importance of correspondence."

TABLE XXVI

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

Institutional Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Prestige of OSU		2,4,5,7,8
2. Program not offered elsewhere	6	1,2,3,4,5,7,8
3. Better program	3,6	
4. Academic reputation	6	
5. Educational-research opportunities	2	
6. Faculty-student rapport		2,4,5
7. Prompt notification of acceptance		2,3,5,7,8
8. Acceptance of transfer credits		1,3,4,5,6,7,8
9. Importance of correspondence	1,2,3,7	

1 = Bordering States; 2 = New England States; 3 = Southeast States;
4 = Plains States; 5 = Far West States; 6 = Rocky Mountain States;
7 = Great Lakes States; 8 = Mideast States

For the section Economic, the only factor given decisive or strong consideration by a majority of respondents within one region was "overall cost less." Of the 15 students from the New England region, 8 (53 percent) of the responses from this group fell within these two points on the scale of consideration. A majority of the respondents from no fewer than four regions felt all four of the Economic factors to be of slight or no consideration in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University.

TABLE XXVII

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR ECONOMIC FACTORS

Economic Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Overall cost less	2	1,3,5,7
2. Tuition level less		1,3,4,5,6,7,8
3. Financial assistance more than from other schools		5,6,7,8
4. Employment opportunities for spouse or self		1,2,3,5,6,7,8

1 = Bordering States; 2 = New England States; 3 = Southeast States'
 4 = Plains States; 5 = Far West States; 6 = Rocky Mountain States;
 7 = Great Lakes States; 8 = Mideast States

Under the Situational section, only one factor was given strong or decisive consideration. Respondents from the Mideast states identified "could gain admittance" as the one factor they considered to be of importance in attending this institution. No pattern related to particular fields of study by respondents from this region could be identified. Within this section all factors were represented on the slight or no consideration scale by at least one geographic region.

TABLE XXVIII

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Situational Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Could gain admittance	8	4
2. Recommended by college teachers		3,5,8
3. Recommended by colleagues		1,2,3,4,5,7,8
4. Discussion with faculty-students		2,5,6
5. Recruitment effort		1,2,3,4,5,7,8
6. Departmental brochure		All Groups
7. Directory information		1,3,4,5,7,8

1 = Bordering States; 2 = New England States; 3 = Southeast States;
4 = Plains States; 5 = Far West States; 6 = Rocky Mountain States;
7 = Great Lakes States; 8 = Mideast States

Within the section Personal, the factor "recommended by friends-acquaintances" was identified as being the only factor to which a majority of respondents from a geographic region gave decisive or strong consideration. Respondents from the New England region so identified this factor. All factors within this section were given slight or no consideration by respondents from no fewer than two geographic regions. Four factors to which respondents from all geographic regions indicated were of slight or no consideration in attending this institution were: "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," "had degree from OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," and "non-academic features."

TABLE XXIX

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Sought a non-localized educational experience		2,5
2. To secure employment in Southwest after graduation		All Groups
3. Proximity to home		2,3,4,5,6,7,8
4. Had degree from OSU-felt at home		All Groups
5. Recommended by friends-acquaintances	2	5,7,8
6. Recommended by parents-relatives		All Groups
7. Non-academic features		All Groups

1 = Bordering States; 2 = New England States; 3 = Southeast States;
4 = Plains States; 5 = Far West States; 6 = Rocky Mountain States;
7 = Great Lakes States; 8 = Mideast States

Responses to Factors by Stipend Status. Of the 426 respondents, 329 (77.4 percent) were recipients of a stipend award while 97 (23.6 percent) received no stipends. Data on Tables XXX through XXXIII reveals the response to factors by students grouped by stipend status.

TABLE XXX

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY STIPEND STATUS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

Institutional Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Prestige of OSU		2
2. Program not offered elsewhere		1,2
3. Better program	2	
4. Academic reputation		
5. Educational-research opportunities		
6. Faculty-student rapport		2
7. Prompt notification of acceptance		1,2
8. Acceptance of transfer credits		1,2
9. Importance of correspondence	1,2	

1 = Stipend; 2 = No Stipend

Under the Institutional section, two factors were identified as having been given decisive or strong consideration. Respondents in the non-stipend group listed "better program" as an important factor, and respondents within both groups cited "importance of correspondence" as a factor to which decisive or strong consideration was given. No trend of agreement was indicated for four factors within the slight or no consideration scale by respondents within either of the two groups. These four factors were: "better program," "academic reputation," "educational-research opportunities," and "importance of correspondence."

TABLE XXXI

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY STIPEND STATUS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR ECONOMIC FACTORS

Economic Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Overall cost less		1,2
2. Tuition level less		1,2
3. Financial assistance more than from other schools	1	2
4. Employment opportunities for spouse or self		1,2

1 = Stipend; 2 = No Stipend

Within the section Economic one factor was cited as having been given decisive or strong consideration by the stipend group: "financial assistance more than from other schools." Of the 329 respondents with stipends 176 (53.4 percent) marked this factor as important in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University. "Slight" or "no consideration" responses were given to three of the four economic factors by respondents in both groups. For the factor "financial assistance more than from other schools" this was given "slight" or "no consideration" by respondents in the non-stipend group.

TABLE XXXII

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY STIPEND STATUS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Situational Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Could gain admittance		
2. Recommended by college teachers		2
3. Recommended by colleagues		1,2
4. Discussion with faculty-students		2
5. Recruitment effort		1,2
6. Departmental Brochure		1,2
7. Directory information		1,2

1 = Stipend; 2 = No Stipend

Within both the Situational and Personal sections no factors were listed as having been given decisive or strong consideration by either of the stipend status groups. On the slight or no consideration scale for the Situational and Personal sections, no trend of agreement was indicated for two factors. These two factors were: "could gain admittance," and "recommended by friends-acquaintances."

TABLE XXXIII

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS BY STIPEND STATUS INDICATING EITHER DECISIVE OR STRONG CONSIDERATION, OR SLIGHT OR NO CONSIDERATION BASED ON RESPONSES EXCEEDING FIFTY PERCENT FOR PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal Factors	Decisive or Strong Consideration	Slight or No Consideration
1. Sought a non-localized educational experience		2
2. To secure employment in Southwest after graduation		1,2
3. Proximity to home		1,2
4. Had degree from OSU-felt at home		1,2
5. Recommended by friends-acquaintances		
6. Recommended by parents-relatives		1,2
7. Non-academic features		1,2

1 = Stipend; 2 = No Stipend

Responses to Factors by Other Specified Categories. Additional investigation was made for two additional specified categories: (1) respondents by sex, and (2) respondents by marital status. Within the four sections of factors previously cited (Institutional, Economic, Situational, and Personal), respondents in both specified categories agreed on only one factor as having been given decisive or strong consideration in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University. That factor was "importance of correspondence."

In comparing the responses by respondents within the sex and marital status categories to respondents within the other specified categories previously cited, the data failed to reveal any distinguishable patterns of responses to the twenty-seven factors with respect to the slight or no consideration scale of measurement.

Summary

In the first portion of this chapter an analysis was presented of the data describing the non-Oklahoma graduate student: home state, degree and major, personal information, financing education, reasons for graduate study, and choosing a graduate college. The second portion of this chapter contained the responses to a list of twenty-seven factors denoting the degree of consideration these factors played in the non-Oklahoma students' decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. An attempt was made to identify those factors the entire population of non-Oklahoma graduate students indicated to be important in deciding to attend this graduate college. An effort was then made to identify by specifically designated categories of students those particular factors which a majority of members within these

categories could agree as being of importance in choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was twofold. First an attempt was made to identify those factors the entire population of 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students considered to be important in their decision to attend a graduate program at one specific institution, Oklahoma State University. The second purpose of this study was to identify by specifically designated categories of students those particular factors which a majority of members within these categories could agree upon as being of importance in choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

This study was designed to obtain data from the 529 non-Oklahoma graduate students enrolled in the Oklahoma State University Graduate College for the spring semester of 1975. The descriptive survey method was used for this study. The questionnaire which was mailed to the subjects consisted of two parts. The first portion of the survey instrument was designed to secure information covering six areas: home state, degree and major, personal information, financing education, reasons for graduate study, and choosing a graduate college. The second portion of the questionnaire presented a list of twenty-seven factors to which non-Oklahoma students were asked to denote the degree of consideration these factors played in their decision to attend the

Oklahoma State University Graduate College. Statistical analysis of the descriptive data involved simple computations of frequency counts, percentages, and means.

Description of Subjects

The non-Oklahoma graduate student population can be described as consisting of a three to one ratio of male to female students which come, in large part, from the six states bordering Oklahoma. The data revealed a rather even distribution of non-resident students enrolled in four of the five graduate college groups. Enrollment within the Humanities Group accounted for only 3 percent of the total non-resident population.

The vast majority of respondents were of the racial origin Caucasian, and over 90 percent of all responding students were under 36 years of age. Nearly 60 percent of the responding graduate students were married and of this number slightly more than half had at least one child.

Summary of Findings

Nearly 50 percent of all respondents indicated they pursued graduate studies for at least one of the following three reasons: "to qualify for a career position," "to obtain a higher degree," or "to gain specialization and/or more competence in my chosen field of study." In response to an open-ended inquiry, respondents were asked to list the three (3) most important reasons for their selection of the department and/or graduate program at Oklahoma State University. The three most frequently cited reasons were, in order: "better program,"

"financial assistance," and "academic reputation."

Data concerning the financing of a graduate education revealed that approximately three-fourths of all non-Oklahoma graduate students were recipients of a stipend award. Respondents also indicated that the money received from the stipend awards constituted the major source of financial income while pursuing graduate studies.

Analysis of Factors Covering All Respondents

Of the twenty-seven factors listed on the survey instrument, there was only one factor upon which a majority (53.5 percent) of all respondents agreed as to having been given decisive and/or strong consideration--"importance of correspondence." There were three factors to which 40 percent or more of all the respondents agreed as having been given decisive and/or strong consideration in their decision to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College. These three factors were: "better program," "financial assistance," and "academic reputation."

Over 50 percent of the respondents cited fifteen (15) factors as having been given slight and/or no consideration in selecting Oklahoma State University as a graduate institution which to attend. These factors were, in order of number of responses received: "had degree from OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," "departmental brochures," "recruitment effort," "acceptance of transfer credit," "directory information," "tuition cost less," "proximity to home," "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," "program not offered elsewhere," "non-academic features," "overall cost less," "employment opportunities for spouse or self," "recommended by colleagues," and

"prompt notification of acceptance."

Analysis of Factors Covering Specified Categories of Respondents

There were four specified categories of respondents to which particular attention was centered. Those four categories were: (1) respondents by academic degrees; (2) respondents by graduate college groups; (3) respondents by geographic areas; and (4) respondents by stipend status. An attempt was made to learn whether particular factors existed upon which a majority of members within these categories could agree as being of importance in choosing to attend the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

In the category respondents by academic degrees, there was only one factor to which a majority of both doctoral and masters students gave decisive and/or strong consideration: "importance of correspondence." There were fifteen (15) factors to which a majority of both doctoral and masters students indicated as having been given slight and/or no consideration. These fifteen factors were: "program not offered elsewhere," "prompt notification of acceptance," "acceptance of transfer credit," "overall cost less," "tuition level less," "employment opportunities for spouse or self," "recommended by colleagues," "recruitment effort," "departmental brochure," "directory information," "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," "proximity to home," "had degree from OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," and "non-academic features."

Taking all five graduate college groups collectively, the majority of respondents failed to agree upon any one factor as having been given

decisive and/or strong consideration. Graduate college groups which showed a majority consensus toward factors given decisive and/or strong consideration were: Teacher Education--"better program"; Biological Sciences--"educational-research opportunities"; Humanities, Social Sciences and Teacher Education--"importance of correspondence"; and Biological Sciences--"sought a non-localized educational experience." There were twelve (12) factors to which a majority of all five graduate college groups indicated as having been given slight and/or no consideration. These twelve factors were: "program not offered elsewhere," "tuition level less," "employment opportunities for spouse or self," "recommended by colleagues," "recruitment effort," "departmental brochure," "directory information," "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," "proximity to home," "had degree from OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," and "non-academic features."

As was true in the case of the graduate college groups, the eight geographic region groups taken as a whole failed to give a majority response to any one factor to which decisive and/or strong consideration had been given. Various geographic region groups which showed a majority consensus toward factors given decisive and/or strong consideration were: Rocky Mountain States--"program not offered elsewhere"; Southeast States and Rocky Mountain States--"better program"; Rocky Mountain States--"academic reputation"; New England States--"educational-research opportunities"; Bordering States, New England States, Southeast States and Great Lakes States--"importance of correspondence"; New England States--"overall cost less"; Mideast States--"could gain admittance"; and New England States--"recommended by friends-acquaintances." There were five (5) factors to which a

majority of all eight geographic region groups indicated as having been given slight and/or no consideration. These five factors were: "departmental brochure," "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," "had degree from OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," and "non-academic features." In addition to these five factors, there were six factors to which seven of the eight geographic region groups indicated as having been given slight and/or no consideration. These six factors were: "acceptance of transfer credit," "tuition level less," "employment opportunities for spouse or self," "recommended by colleagues," "recruitment effort," and "proximity to home." As suggested earlier in this study, the reader should note the small sample size of respondents within the various geographic region groups (See Table II, pp. 36-37.).

With respect to the category respondents by stipend status, there were only three factors to which a majority of students within either the combined or the separate groups gave decisive and/or strong consideration. These three factors were: Stipend and No Stipend--"importance of correspondence," No Stipend--"better program," and Stipend--"financial assistance more than from other schools." There were fifteen (15) factors to which a majority of both Stipend and No Stipend respondents indicated as having been given slight and/or no consideration. The fifteen factors were: "program not offered elsewhere," "prompt notification of acceptance," "acceptance of transfer credit," "overall cost less," "tuition level less," "employment opportunities for spouse or self," "recommended by colleagues," "recruitment effort," "departmental brochure," "directory information," "to secure employment in Southwest after graduation," "proximity to home," "had degree from

OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," and "non-academic features."

By combining all 17 groups of respondents within all four categories, there was no one factor upon which a simple majority could agree as having been given decisive and/or strong consideration. There were only five (5) factors upon which a majority of all 17 groups of respondents within all four categories could agree as having been given slight and/or no consideration. These five factors were: "departmental brochure," "to secure employment opportunities in Southwest after graduation," "had degree from OSU-felt at home," "recommended by parents-relatives," and "non-academic features."

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the data received from respondents who participated in this study.

1. A three-fourths majority of the non-Oklahoma graduate students attending Oklahoma State University do receive a stipend. The stipend recipients, regardless of their categorization, considered their stipend as the major source of support while attending graduate school. The findings of this study confirm the findings of previous studies which stressed the importance graduate students placed on the offer of financial assistance in their decision to pursue graduate studies. This may suggest that the amount of support being offered would affect the attractiveness of graduate programs at Oklahoma State University to out-of-state students.

2. The respondents' decision to attend Oklahoma State University was likely comprised of multiple factors based on individual circum-

stances of each student. The issue of factor value may become important where multiple factors are involved in the students' decision to attend a graduate institution. One may ask, is the offer of financial aid six times as important as correspondence received from an institution? Or, is the academic quality of a department's program three times as important to the students as recommendations received from friends and acquaintances in making their decision to attend a given institution? One suspects where multiple factors are included in the decision making process, factors are likely to be of unequal value.

Closely allied to the concept of multiple factors is the difficulty encountered in attempting to utilize the data for predictive purposes. The researcher might wish to predict, for example, what factors male students of a specific age, married, with two children, and from a specified geographic area considered to be important in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University. When attempting to categorize respondents by combining the categories of age, marital status, children, and geographic regions, the researcher would likely discover that accurate conclusions and predictions would possibly be difficult to obtain.

3. The factors which respondents in this study regarded as important in making the decision to attend Oklahoma State University were closely allied to factors cited to be important in other studies. A partial list of these factors included "quality of program," "financial assistance," "academic reputation of department," and "educational-research opportunities.

3. Selected factors within this study which were originally thought to be important in the students' decision to attend an out-of-

state graduate college gave evidence of being unimportant. The results of studies by Grigg and Baird also revealed that numerous factors within their questionnaires were of minimal importance in the decision of students to attend a given graduate college. Generally speaking, the respondents of this study substantiated the findings of the studies conducted by Grigg and Baird. Among the factors considered to be unimportant were: "chance to work under a particular teacher," "attended the university as an undergraduate," "advice of teachers at another school," "advice of parents," "visit from someone recruiting from a school," and "information listed in directories and brochures."

5. Some of the responses to factors may have been the result of the nature of the questionnaire as opposed to the students' real reasons as suggested by a comparison between open-ended responses and structured responses. A case in point is the factor "importance of correspondence." From the list of twenty-seven factors, "importance of correspondence" was the only factor to which a majority of all respondents agreed as having been given decisive and/or strong consideration. In contrast, the factor "quick response . . . impressed with correspondence. . ." received from respondents answering the open-ended inquiry failed to demonstrate the same degree of importance as was evident in the structured response (See Table XI, p. 50.).

In responding to an open-ended question, the students may have listed those factors they considered to be socially acceptable in choosing a graduate institution to attend. Such socially acceptable factors could include "prestige of the institution," "research opportunities," and the like. However, in being forced to choose from among specified factors within a given list, factors other than those

considered to be socially acceptable may emerge as being of importance in the students' decision to attend a specific institution. The factor "importance of correspondence" is not generally identified as a socially acceptable reason for choosing a graduate institution. Yet, this factor emerged as one to which a majority of students gave decisive and/or strong consideration in choosing to attend Oklahoma State University.

6. The structure of the questionnaire may have tended to elicit only positive responses regarding the students' choice of a graduate college. Very few negative responses were received from students responding to the survey instrument. Perhaps this was encouraged by the nature of the questions which dealt with factors which were of a positive nature. Because all factors were constructed with a positive emphasis, this may have been the cause of eliciting only positive factors.

Another related aspect may have been an avoidance behavior characteristic. The questionnaire did not permit students to express avoidance behavior characteristics. In selecting an institution, it may be easier for a student to identify certain factors he wished to avoid. For example, the student may consider such factors as "a minimum amount of administrative red-tape in meeting degree requirements" or "choosing an academic program which is not too difficult academically but yet is academically respectable" as being of great importance in selecting a graduate college to attend.

7. Certain factors within the list of twenty-seven factors may have contained some degree of ambiguity. The problem of ambiguity is two edged. Certain factors may have lacked clear and precise definition

for students' responses to the factors, and likewise, the interpretation of the intent of the responses by the researcher.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results and conclusions of this study can be substantiated through similar additional investigations on certain important aspects which affect the students' decision to attend a graduate institution outside of their home state. Further study in the following areas would seem pertinent and important.

1. It is recommended a study be conducted at Oklahoma State University to investigate further the factors non-resident graduate students consider to be important in choosing to attend this institution. Such a study should continue beyond the exploratory, descriptive approach taken by this research study.

The proposed investigation would utilize the factor analysis method. The investigation would also include the weighting of various factors, validity and reliability measurements of the instrument, and pilot testing of the instrument with a non-resident graduate student group from another university.

Factors which were found to be important in the present research study should be given maximum attention. An example would be the factor "importance of correspondence." Further attention should be given to looking at the various subunits comprising this factor. Subunits could include correspondence from department, correspondence from faculty, rapidity with which correspondence was received, personal interest in the student as reflected in the correspondence, and the like. Without knowing the kind of correspondence, one does not know

the real reasons for students selecting "importance of correspondence" as a major factor in their decision to attend a specific graduate institution. A more thorough investigation should thus be directed toward identifying subunits of those factors respondents identified as being important in their decision to attend Oklahoma State University. Further insights into the reasons for attending an out-of-state graduate institution will materialize when studies emphasizing further refinement of important factors are conducted.

In addition, new factors should be sought from recommendations suggested by graduate students, members of the graduate school faculty, and graduate school administrators. Factors to which slight and/or no consideration was given by responding students in the present study should be given minimum attention in the proposed study.

It may also be possible that a more careful structuring of demographic and other related information would facilitate a clearer interpretation of the data in a proposed study. For example, such a possibility could exist in the area of financing of the non-resident students' graduate education. With carefully structured financial data it may be possible to show if there exists an inverse ratio between the proximity of state of origin and the size of stipend a student receives.

2. It would be of interest to pursue a study which attempted to measure the perceptions prospective graduate students hold of Oklahoma State University and contrast the results with perceptions prospective undergraduates hold of this institution. On the graduate level, it may be that the individual students perceive the institution solely in light of the department as opposed to the broader view of the graduate

college. If one is a biochemist, one's perception of Oklahoma State University is likely related to the reputation of the biochemistry department. Thus for the graduate student, one's perception of an institution is an outgrowth of the perception of the department of which the student is a part. Most likely the graduate student attends college to obtain a specific education, not a broad educational experience. The undergraduates may perceive the institution in light of university wide activities: intramurals, fraternities, athletics, student government and the like. Therefore, a comparative study between the source of perceptions and attitudes graduate students and undergraduates could be a possibility for future research.

3. Once it can be established what the perceptions are, another appropriate study would be to determine how these perceptions relate to the non-resident graduate students' satisfaction with their program after having attended Oklahoma State University for a period of time. Such a study could be conducted through the pre- and post-test method. A pre-test could be administered within the first month of the students' enrollment at the University. At the completion of the first year or upon graduation a post-test could be administered to the same students. Thus, a pre-perception and post-perception analysis of the non-resident graduate students could be attained.

Questions for which answers could be sought are as follows. Do the students' perception of the institution persist? Are the perceptions of what comprises the University retained? Are there areas of perception in which students are receiving misinterpretations of the institution? If so, what are these areas? If the perceptions do not hold up with what the students actually find, what areas tend to be the

source of dissatisfaction? Answers to these and related questions would be the basis for a study related to the initial factors students considered to be important in choosing to attend this institution and subsequent satisfaction with the program in which these students are enrolled.

4. A study should be directed toward the prospective non-Oklahoma graduate student who indicated an initial interest in attending Oklahoma State University, but who for some reason(s) chose not to attend. What were the reasons for not attending? Was the University possibly at fault in some way for the prospective students' decision not to enroll after an initial inquiry? These and other questions related to initial interest and subsequent non-enrollment would provide the impetus for further research.

5. In addition to these kinds of studies dealing with the non-resident graduate students' selection of an out-of-state institution, there are other factors concerning graduate school attendance which may be of research interest. One area would include the attitude of faculty as related to the importance they place on the value of the non-resident students' contribution of the institution's graduate program. Another area of interest would involve study of the attitudes of the various state coordinating boards of higher education on establishing reciprocal agreements between the states so as to initiate and encourage interstate attendance of public universities by graduate students.

A broader study of public and private institutions offering graduate programs is proposed. A question to which answers could be sought is, is the attitude of the private institution toward out-of-state graduate students any different from attitudes manifested by public

institutions. Within the public institutions there are varying policies with respect to graduate student enrollment. Some public institutions offering graduate programs do not charge an out-of-state fee for graduate student enrollment while other public institutions charge a higher fee. One might wish to investigate further the types of rules and regulations regarding the matter of higher fees and the underlying philosophies of institutions concerning this matter.

6. Another area to which research attention should be directed concerns the in-state graduate students. Is Oklahoma State University really concerned about the enrollment of in-state graduate students? Does this institution merely assume that in-state students will attend regardless of the school's interest in their enrollment? Does Oklahoma State University concern itself with factors that attract in-state students to its campus? What factors are instrumental in causing Oklahoma students to attend graduate institutions in other states? Answers to these and related questions are important to gaining a better understanding of both the University and the clientele which constitutes the greater portion of the institution's graduate enrollment.

7. An area which has been untapped and actually excluded from this particular study deals with international students. According to the July, 1975, issue of American Education, more than 150,000 students from other countries were enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States during 1973-74. This, the largest enrollment ever--surpassing the figures of the previous year by approximately 3.5 percent--represented a quadrupling in less than 20 years of the number

of foreign students studying in this country.¹ Therefore, it is conceivable that many of the foregoing recommendations could also be couched in terms related to a study of international students attending the Oklahoma State University Graduate College.

Concluding Statement

The above recommendations suggest other avenues for research in this area. The conclusions to this study would indicate there still exist unanswered questions as to the exact reasons students choose to migrate from their home state to attend a graduate program in another state. Therefore, there is the suggestion that perhaps the process of selecting an institution is more complex than can be specified in a simple, descriptive questionnaire.

¹Delton Moore, "Foreign Students in U.S. Colleges," American Education, Vol. 11, No. 5 (June 5, 1975), back cover.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, Alexander W. Who Goes Where to College? Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965.
- Baird, Leonard L. The Educational Goals of College-Bound Youth. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, Inc., 1967.
- _____. "The Relation of Graduate Students' Role Relationship to Their State of Academic Career, Employment, and Academic Success." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 7 (1972), pp. 428-441.
- _____. The Graduate: A Report on the Characteristics and Plans of College Seniors. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, Inc., 1973.
- _____. Careers and Curricula. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, Inc., 1974.
- Cross, K. Patricia. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, Inc., 1968.
- Douvan, Elizabeth, and Carol Kaye. "Motivational Factors in College Entrance." The American College, N. Sanford, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 193-224.
- Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore N. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. 2 vols. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.
- Grigg, Charles M. Recruitment to Graduate Study. SREB Research Monograph No. 10. Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board, 1965.
- Gropper, George L. and Robert Fitzpatrick. Who Goes to Graduate School? Pittsburg: American Institute for Research, 1959.
- Hoyt, D. P., et al. The Two-Year College and Its Students: An Empirical Report. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, Inc., 1969.
- Katz, Joseph, et al., The College Student. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc., 1968.
- Lloyd-Jones, Ester M., and Herman A. Estrin. The American Student and His College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

- Moore, Delton. "Foreign Students in U. S. Colleges," American Education, Vol. 11, No. 5 (June 5), 1975, back cover.
- Mouley, George J. The Science of Educational Research. New York: American Book Co., 1963.
- Nelson, James H. "A Study of High School Seniors' Image of California Colleges and Universities." (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of California at Los Angeles, 1961).
- Panos, Robert J. Some Characteristics of Junior College Students. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Richards, James M., Jr., and John Holland. A Factor Analysis of Student "Explanations" of Their Choice of a College. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, Inc., 1965.
- United States Office of Education. Digest of Educational Statistics--1973 Edition. W. Vance Grant and C. George Liris, editors. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1974, p. 70.
- _____. Education Directory 1973-74--Higher Education. Hazel C. Poole, editor. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1974, p. xxii.
- _____. Residence and Migration of College Students--Fall 1968: Basic State to State Matrix Table. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, National Center for Educational Statistics, May, 1970.
- Vahle, H. Kurt. "The Importance of Color in Advertising." Manual File 4050. New York: Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., (ND).
- Van Dalen, Debold B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Out-of-State Students in the West's Public Colleges and Universities. Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, July, 1962. ED 000 206.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE

Each year thousands of American graduate students attend universities in states where they are not "residents." Most educators are convinced that out-of-state students are a distinct asset to the educational life of the campus. A wide diversity of backgrounds, viewpoints, and experiences give life and meaning to the intellectually maturing process which much of graduate study is designed to provide.

Better than one third of this year's OSU graduate enrollment is composed of students from other states. You are one of this select group of students, and this letter is to solicit your participation in a study I'm doing for my dissertation.

The investigation will yield a profile of the Oklahoma State University non-resident graduate student and will seek to discover and describe the motivational or enabling factors that were important in the decision to attend this university.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed for brief answers and should take no more than fifteen minutes to complete--although you are encouraged to add as many comments as you wish. You will notice the questionnaire is numbered; this is for follow-up purposes only. Your anonymity as a participant is insured. All information will be held strictly confidential and handled as group data. Because this is a relatively small population for study, your participation is very important. It is hoped you will be able to return this questionnaire very soon in the enclosed postage paid envelope.

Thank you for an early reply.

Very truly yours,

Robert K. Poinsett
Graduate Student

Oklahoma State University
Graduate College
Whitehurst 202
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dear Graduate Student:

Mr. Bob Poinsett, a doctoral candidate at the Oklahoma State University, is undertaking a research study dealing with the variables which influence candidates desiring to further their professional development in selection of academic departments.

Since a large number of our graduate students do come from other states, this study will yield a profile of these candidates and will seek to discover and describe the motivational factors that were important in the decision to attend Oklahoma State University.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to work with Mr. Poinsett and feel the information will be very useful in seeking qualified applicants for our graduate programs. Because this is a relatively small population for study, the participation of every person is desired.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Norman N. Durham
Dean, Graduate College

A few weeks ago the enclosed questionnaire was mailed to you along with a letter seeking your assistance in surveying the population of non-resident graduate students who have chosen to attend Oklahoma State University.

The survey is moving along quite satisfactorily. Nearly 70% of the non-resident graduate students have already answered questionnaires. It is hoped this survey will reflect the opinions of all Oklahoma State University non-resident graduate students. Whatever your status--part-time or full-time--a beginning master's student or a doctoral candidate completing a dissertation--your response is important to this survey.

The enclosed materials, including a postage paid return envelope, are for your convenience in case the original mailing went astray or has been mislaid. Would you be willing to return your answered questionnaire by Wednesday, March 26? Your prompt response is urgently requested in order that the research findings may be analyzed and reported as soon as possible.

Thank you for an early response.

Very truly yours,

Bob Poinsett
Graduate Student

P.S. I would like to warmly thank you for your interest and participation in this study. If you have already submitted your return, please accept my thanks.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT

E. REASON FOR GRADUATE STUDY

Please state what you consider to be the most important reason(s) for pursuing graduate studies (e.g., "to obtain a higher degree," and/or "to prepare for another position," etc.).

F. CHOOSING A GRADUATE COLLEGE

1. In deciding to attend a graduate college (check only one)

I purposefully eliminated seriously considering all graduate colleges within my home-state [state where you resided at time of applying to OSU].

I seriously considered graduate colleges both within my home-state and out-of-state.

I seriously considered graduate colleges within my home-state but Oklahoma State University was the only out-of-state graduate college I seriously considered.

2. If you were formally admitted to a graduate college at any other institution, why did you choose to attend Oklahoma State University? (Be as specific as possible)

3. Considering only those graduate colleges to which you were formally admitted, was your choice of Oklahoma State University

your first choice of a graduate college?

dictated by some circumstances? (Please describe fully the circumstances that dictated your choice, (e.g., "only school to offer financial assistance," etc.)

Directions for Following Section

For each of the factors given on the following pages, please respond to each of the statements by CIRCLING the response denoting the degree of consideration it played in your decision to attend the Oklahoma State University (OSU) Graduate College.

Please respond to each item. All responses will be kept confidential.

Circle:

- 1 if factor was a decisive consideration in choosing to attend OSU
- 2 if factor was a strong consideration
- 3 if factor was given consideration
- 4 if factor was given only slight consideration
- 5 if factor was not considered or not applicable

Consideration of factor in choosing to attend OSU

INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

1. Prestige of OSU	1	2	3	4	5
2. OSU offered course of study (major) <u>not</u> offered in other graduate colleges I considered	1	2	3	4	5
3. OSU offered a program I regarded as better than a similar program in other graduate colleges I considered	1	2	3	4	5
4. Academic reputation of department	1	2	3	4	5
5. Educational and research opportunities of department	1	2	3	4	5
6. Faculty-student rapport in department	1	2	3	4	5
7. Speed of processing my application and prompt notification of admittance to OSU	1	2	3	4	5
8. Acceptance of transfer credits that would apply to my current degree program	1	2	3	4	5
9. Favorable impression from correspondence and communications received from department and/or graduate college at OSU	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Institutional Factors if any

ECONOMIC FACTORS

1. Overall cost of a graduate program at OSU <u>less</u> than other graduate colleges I considered	1	2	3	4	5
2. Tuition level at OSU <u>less</u> expensive than "tuition and fees" in states of other graduate colleges I considered	1	2	3	4	5
3. Financial assistance from OSU exceeded financial assistance from other graduate colleges I considered	1	2	3	4	5
4. Employment opportunities for myself and/or spouse while in graduate school	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Economic Factors if any

SITUATIONAL FACTORS

1. Could meet OSU admissions requirements	1	2	3	4	5
2. Department and/or OSU recommended by my college teachers	1	2	3	4	5
3. Department and/or OSU recommended by my colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
4. Discussions with OSU faculty members and/or departmental graduate students	1	2	3	4	5
5. Recruitment efforts by an OSU department representative	1	2	3	4	5
6. Departmental brochure (as posted on bulletin boards)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Information listed in directories or guides to graduate or professional study	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Situational Factors if any

Consideration of factor in choosing to attend OSU

PERSONAL FACTORS

1. My decision to earn a graduate degree from a college outside the area of my home-state to prevent receiving a "localized" educational experience	1	2	3	4	5
2. My desire to continue a professional career within this southwestern geographic region upon graduation	1	2	3	4	5
3. Nearness of OSU in relation to my permanent home-state residence	1	2	3	4	5
4. Had another degree from OSU, felt at home	1	2	3	4	5
5. Department and/or OSU recommended by my friends or acquaintances	1	2	3	4	5
6. Department and/or OSU recommended by my parents or relatives	1	2	3	4	5
7. Non-academic features (e.g., climate, cultural events, nearness to outside activities, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

[If you considered certain non-academic features to be of importance, please specify features]

Comments on Personal Factors if any

LIST THE 3 MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FOR YOUR SELECTION OF THE DEPARTMENT and/or GRADUATE PROGRAM AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY .

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Additional comments related to, but not covered by, the scope of this questionnaire are most welcomed.

Please return this questionnaire in the post-paid, self-addressed envelope provided for your convenience.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX C

FIELDS OF GRADUATE STUDY

FIELDS OF GRADUATE STUDY IN WHICH DEGREES
ARE OFFERED AT THE OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY

I. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Master's and Doctoral Degrees

Agronomy (M.S. only)
 Ph.D. in Crop Science
 Ph.D. in Social Science
 Animal Science (M.S. only)
 Ph.D. in Animal Breeding
 Ph.D. in Animal Nutrition
 Botany and Plant Pathology (M.S. only)
 Ph.D. in Botany
 Dairy Science (M.S. only)
 Ph.D. in Animal Breeding
 Ph.D. in Animal Nutrition
 Entomology
 Food Science
 Animal Science Department
 Biochemistry Department
 Dairy Science Department
 Poultry Science Department
 Microbiology
 Physiological Sciences
 Poultry Science (M.S. only)
 Ph.D. in Animal Breeding
 Ph.D. in Animal Nutrition
 Veterinary Parasitology and Public Health
 Veterinary Pathology
 Wildlife Ecology
 Zoology

Master's Degree Only

Food, Nutrition and Institution Administration
 Forest Resources
 Horticulture

II. HUMANITIES

Master's and Doctoral Degrees
EnglishMaster's Degree Only
Philosophy
Speech

III. PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

Master's and Doctoral Degrees
Agricultural Engineering (M.S. and M. Engr.)
Biochemistry
Chemical Engineering (M.S. and M. Engr.)
Chemistry
Civil Engineering (M.S. and M. Engr.)
Electrical Engineering (M.S. and M. Engr.)
General Engineering (M.S. and M. Engr.)
Industrial Engineering and Management (M.S. and M. Engr.)
Mathematics
Mechanical Engineering
 Aero Space and Mechanical (M.S. and M. Engr.)
Physics
StatisticsMaster's Degree Only
Architecture (M. Engr.)
Architectural Engineering (M. Engr.)
Bioenvironmental Engineering
Computing and Information Sciences
Geology
Nuclear Engineering

IV. SOCIAL SCIENCES

Doctor's Degree Only
Business AdministrationMaster's and Doctoral Degrees
Agricultural Economics
Economics
History
Psychology
Sociology

Master's Degree Only

Accounting
 Business Administration
 Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising
 Corrections
 Family Relations and Child Development
 Geography
 Home Management, Equipment and Family Economics
 Housing and Interior Design
 Mass Communication
 Political Science

V. TEACHER EDUCATION

Master's and Doctoral Degrees

Agricultural Education
 Business Education
 Education
 Educational Administration
 Educational Psychology
 Elementary Education
 Higher Education
 Secondary Education
 Student Personnel and Guidance
 Vocational-Technical and Career Education
 Home Economics Education

Master's Degree Only

Health, Physical Education and Recreation
 Industrial Arts Education
 Natural Science
 Rural Adult Education
 Technical Education
 Trade and Industrial Education

APPENDIX D

RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC DEGREE GROUPS

Doctoral Degree Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	7	24	41	30	37	45	37	30	63	22	13	64	29	37	35	24	49	20	9	16	32	20	30	14	41	4	17
	%	3	11	19	14	17	20	17	14	29	10	6	29	13	17	16	11	22	9	4	7	15	9	14	6	19	2	8
2	N	33	29	55	55	50	41	47	34	61	19	20	36	28	37	40	48	36	21	15	25	42	22	25	4	40	4	23
	%	15	13	25	25	23	19	21	15	28	9	9	16	13	17	18	22	16	10	7	12	19	10	11	2	18	2	11
3	N	71	31	49	63	66	41	23	22	43	42	37	19	29	46	35	25	45	22	23	34	34	29	33	6	48	12	37
	%	33	14	22	29	29	19	11	10	19	19	17	9	13	21	16	11	20	10	11	15	15	13	15	3	22	5	17
4	N	46	22	24	27	28	26	29	20	20	41	48	17	23	33	23	25	26	12	20	30	18	24	12	1	20	13	23
	%	21	10	11	12	13	12	13	9	9	19	22	8	11	15	10	11	12	5	9	14	8	11	6	1	9	6	10
5	N	63	114	51	45	40	67	84	114	33	96	102	84	111	67	87	98	64	145	153	115	94	125	120	195	71	187	120
	%	23	52	23	20	18	30	38	52	15	43	64	38	50	30	40	45	30	66	69	52	43	57	54	88	32	85	54
Total		220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	220
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded off to nearest whole number.

Master's Degree Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	8	22	36	28	28	27	22	8	42	15	14	62	36	37	34	19	30	15	8	14	49	27	22	17	31	8	13
	%	4	11	18	13	14	14	11	4	21	7	7	31	17	18	17	9	14	7	4	7	24	13	11	9	15	4	6
2	N	43	26	55	60	49	35	28	11	62	24	23	21	28	31	38	24	44	11	9	19	41	34	17	5	37	9	29
	%	21	13	27	30	24	17	14	5	31	12	11	10	14	15	19	12	22	6	5	9	20	17	8	2	19	5	14
3	N	55	21	35	61	55	44	37	26	34	35	31	20	19	52	30	30	31	15	26	25	27	19	22	2	34	13	35
	%	27	10	17	30	27	21	18	12	16	17	15	10	9	25	14	15	15	7	12	12	13	9	11	1	16	6	17
4	N	35	24	23	16	30	23	34	17	22	32	38	19	24	26	17	31	19	18	29	29	20	17	22	4	28	11	21
	%	17	17	11	8	15	11	17	9	11	16	19	9	12	13	8	15	9	9	14	14	10	8	11	2	14	5	11
5	N	62	110	54	38	41	74	82	141	43	97	97	81	96	57	84	99	79	144	131	116	66	106	120	175	73	162	105
	%	31	54	27	19	20	37	40	70	21	48	48	40	48	29	42	49	40	71	65	58	33	53	59	86	36	80	52
Total		203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203	203
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

**Masters Degree includes one person enrolled in Specialist Degree Program.

APPENDIX E

RESPONDENTS BY GRADUATE COLLEGE GROUPS

Biological Sciences Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	4	8	11	9	19	9	7	4	14	5	2	21	9	14	14	5	9	6	6	9	18	12	11	4	10	1	6
	%	5	10	14	11	24	11	9	5	17	6	2	26	11	17	17	6	11	8	7	11	23	15	14	5	12	1	7
2	N	23	6	27	27	23	10	8	3	22	5	6	12	11	8	24	12	16	8	6	10	24	11	10	1	18	2	13
	%	29	7	34	34	29	12	10	4	28	6	7	15	14	10	30	15	20	10	7	12	30	14	12	1	23	2	16
3	N	20	14	9	25	20	15	18	8	16	14	14	4	6	19	12	10	18	5	7	6	14	13	9	2	14	6	13
	%	25	18	11	31	25	19	22	10	20	18	18	5	7	24	15	13	22	6	9	8	17	16	11	2	17	8	16
4	N	13	8	12	9	9	18	13	7	12	16	16	10	11	12	4	12	11	9	7	10	5	8	10	3	11	8	10
	%	16	10	15	11	11	23	16	9	15	20	20	13	14	15	5	15	14	11	9	13	6	10	11	4	14	10	13
5	N	20	44	21	10	9	28	34	58	16	40	42	33	44	27	26	41	26	52	54	45	19	36	40	70	27	63	38
	%	25	55	26	13	11	35	43	72	20	50	53	41	54	34	33	51	33	65	68	56	24	45	50	88	34	79	48
Total		80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Humanities Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	1	4	3	3	5	3	2	0	0	4	2	0	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	4
	%	0	7	0	7	15	31	23	7	31	23	23	39	23	15	0	0	31	15	0	8	31	15	15	15	15	15	31
2	N	1	1	5	3	2	2	3	0	7	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	2
	%	8	8	39	23	15	15	23	0	54	15	15	7	8	15	23	15	15	8	8	8	8	23	0	0	15	0	15
3	N	6	1	2	5	4	3	0	1	1	3	1	3	1	3	3	1	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
	%	46	8	15	39	31	23	0	8	8	23	8	23	8	23	23	8	23	0	8	0	15	8	8	0	8	0	0
4	N	2	2	3	1	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	1	3
	%	15	15	23	8	31	0	8	8	0	0	15	8	7	0	15	15	0	8	15	15	0	8	8	0	15	8	23
5	N	4	8	3	3	1	4	6	10	1	5	5	3	7	6	5	8	4	9	9	9	6	6	9	11	6	10	4
	%	31	62	23	23	8	31	46	77	7	39	39	23	54	47	39	62	31	69	69	69	46	46	69	85	47	77	31
Total		13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Percentage		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Physical Sciences and Engineering Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	2	15	18	8	13	17	14	3	25	9	6	25	11	14	18	12	18	11	4	7	19	9	5	8	19	3	7
	%	12	14	18	8	12	17	14	3	25	8	5	25	11	13	18	12	18	11	4	7	19	9	5	8	19	3	7
2	N	12	16	19	28	22	15	13	7	24	10	9	13	16	16	15	10	16	6	3	8	10	12	8	2	13	5	12
	%	12	16	19	28	22	15	12	7	24	10	9	13	15	16	15	10	16	6	3	8	10	12	8	2	13	5	12
3	N	32	11	25	37	30	18	16	15	17	16	15	11	17	19	17	16	19	10	14	16	14	8	10	5	17	8	15
	%	31	11	25	37	30	18	16	15	17	16	15	11	17	19	17	16	19	10	14	16	14	7	10	5	17	8	15
4	N	23	10	11	6	13	9	13	7	8	16	18	8	10	15	7	14	6	6	14	11	9	12	7	0	16	4	10
	%	23	10	10	5	13	8	13	7	7	16	18	8	10	15	6	14	5	6	14	11	8	12	7	0	16	4	10
5	N	32	49	28	22	23	42	45	69	27	50	53	44	47	37	44	49	42	68	66	59	49	60	71	86	36	81	57
	%	32	49	28	22	23	42	45	68	27	50	53	44	46	37	44	48	42	67	65	58	49	60	70	85	35	80	56
Total		101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Social Sciences Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	5	8	22	31	23	11	21	11	30	12	11	42	23	25	22	9	17	10	4	9	19	14	14	9	18	3	8
	%	4	6	18	25	18	9	17	9	24	9	9	33	18	20	17	7	13	8	3	7	15	11	11	7	14	2	6
2	N	21	10	29	28	29	28	21	12	35	15	12	17	17	19	24	25	25	7	5	14	23	13	13	4	25	5	17
	%	17	8	23	22	23	22	17	9	28	12	10	14	14	15	20	20	20	6	4	11	18	10	10	3	20	4	14
3	N	31	13	28	29	33	32	20	10	32	24	25	13	10	29	18	16	19	13	21	24	18	12	18	0	23	3	16
	%	25	10	22	23	26	25	15	8	25	19	19	10	8	23	14	13	15	10	17	19	14	10	14	0	18	2	13
4	N	27	15	17	16	20	14	22	11	13	20	22	12	11	20	16	11	21	12	17	20	17	10	7	1	10	7	14
	%	21	12	13	13	16	11	18	9	10	16	18	10	8	16	12	9	17	11	13	16	14	8	6	1	8	6	11
5	N	42	80	30	22	21	41	42	82	16	55	56	42	65	33	46	65	44	84	79	59	49	77	74	112	50	108	71
	%	33	64	24	17	17	33	33	65	13	44	44	33	52	26	37	51	35	67	63	47	39	61	59	89	40	86	56
Total		126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Teacher Education Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	4	15	27	9	8	31	14	19	32	8	5	28	19	20	16	17	31	6	4	5	21	10	20	8	23	3	6
	%	4	14	25	9	8	29	13	18	30	8	5	27	18	19	15	16	29	6	4	5	20	10	19	7	22	3	6
2	N	19	22	30	29	23	20	29	23	35	11	14	13	11	23	12	23	21	10	9	11	25	17	11	1	19	2	8
	%	18	21	28	27	22	19	28	22	33	10	13	12	10	22	11	22	20	9	8	10	24	16	10	1	18	2	7
3	N	37	13	20	29	33	18	12	14	11	20	12	17	14	28	15	12	17	9	6	13	13	14	17	2	25	8	25
	%	35	12	19	27	31	17	11	13	10	19	11	16	13	26	14	11	16	8	6	12	12	13	16	2	24	7	24
4	N	16	11	4	11	13	9	14	11	9	21	29	10	14	12	11	18	8	3	9	16	7	10	9	1	11	4	10
	%	15	10	4	10	12	8	13	10	9	20	28	9	13	11	11	17	8	3	8	15	6	9	9	1	10	4	9
5	N	30	45	25	28	29	28	37	39	19	46	46	38	48	23	52	36	29	78	78	61	40	55	49	94	28	89	57
	%	28	43	24	27	27	27	35	37	18	43	43	36	46	22	49	34	27	74	74	58	38	52	46	89	26	84	54
Total		106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

APPENDIX F

RESPONDENTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION GROUPS

Bordering States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	5	21	37	23	23	29	30	17	49	9	6	47	25	30	27	19	42	8	2	6	21	27	39	16	31	6	13
	%	3	12	22	13	13	17	17	10	28	5	4	27	15	17	16	11	24	5	1	4	12	16	23	9	18	3	8
2	N	36	28	47	51	42	38	35	17	53	10	10	24	26	26	39	32	32	16	15	15	40	35	33	4	39	10	24
	%	21	16	27	30	24	22	20	10	31	6	6	14	15	15	23	19	19	9	8	8	23	20	19	2	23	6	14
3	N	59	22	34	57	55	39	25	19	36	34	26	17	18	39	28	23	35	16	20	22	27	21	35	5	40	10	31
	%	34	13	20	33	32	23	15	11	21	20	15	10	10	23	16	13	21	9	12	13	16	12	20	3	26	6	18
4	N	34	18	19	15	25	18	28	18	12	31	47	17	21	27	25	35	21	20	20	28	19	20	23	3	24	13	23
	%	20	11	11	9	15	10	16	10	7	18	27	10	12	16	15	20	12	12	12	16	11	12	14	2	14	8	13
5	N	38	83	35	26	27	48	54	101	22	88	83	67	82	50	53	63	42	112	115	101	65	69	42	144	38	133	81
	%	22	48	20	15	16	28	31	59	13	51	48	39	48	29	31	37	24	65	67	59	38	40	24	84	22	77	47
Total		172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172	172
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

New England States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	0	3	2	2	2	1	2	0	5	5	3	4	2	3	4	0	2	1	2	2	4	1	0	0	4	0	2
	%	0	20	13	13	13	7	13	0	33	33	20	27	13	20	27	0	13	7	13	13	27	7	0	0	27	0	13
2	N	2	1	3	5	7	2	3	1	3	3	4	2	1	2	3	3	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	1	2
	%	13	7	20	33	47	13	26	6	20	20	27	13	7	13	20	20	13	7	0	13	13	0	0	0	27	7	13
3	N	3	1	5	3	1	4	1	7	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	2	0	2	4	1	2	1	0	1	0	2
	%	20	7	33	20	7	27	7	47	13	7	13	13	13	20	6	7	13	0	13	27	7	13	7	0	6	0	13
4	N	3	0	1	1	0	2	3	3	4	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	2
	%	20	0	7	7	0	13	20	20	27	13	13	13	13	20	0	0	0	0	7	7	6	20	13	7	0	0	13
5	N	7	10	4	4	5	6	6	4	1	4	4	5	8	4	7	11	9	13	10	6	7	9	12	14	6	14	7
	%	47	66	27	27	33	40	40	27	7	27	27	34	54	27	47	73	61	86	67	40	47	60	80	93	40	93	48
Total		15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Southeast States Respondents

Responses		Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	N	6	8	18	13	16	15	7	7	18	8	6	26	13	11	14	10	15	10	6	6	22	9	10	6	10	3	7
	%	7	10	22	16	20	18	8	9	22	6	7	32	16	14	17	12	17	12	7	7	27	11	12	7	12	4	9
2	N	16	12	27	23	17	13	11	13	23	10	11	11	9	14	11	14	16	1	4	9	14	7	6	2	14	2	6
	%	20	15	33	28	21	16	14	16	29	12	14	14	11	17	14	17	20	1	5	11	17	9	8	3	17	2	7
3	N	23	8	12	22	18	14	13	8	16	13	12	5	9	22	12	11	11	7	9	14	8	12	10	1	18	3	12
	%	29	10	15	28	22	17	16	10	20	16	15	6	11	27	15	14	14	9	11	17	10	14	12	1	22	4	15
4	N	14	10	8	5	13	11	15	6	10	10	9	9	9	7	5	9	11	6	7	11	9	7	4	1	12	3	5
	%	17	12	10	6	16	14	19	7	12	12	11	11	11	9	6	11	14	7	9	14	11	9	5	1	15	4	6
5	N	22	43	16	18	17	28	35	47	14	40	43	30	41	27	39	37	28	57	55	41	28	46	51	71	27	70	51
	%	27	53	20	22	21	35	43	58	17	50	53	37	51	33	48	46	35	71	68	51	35	57	63	88	34	86	63
Total		81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Plains States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	0	2	0	1	8	4	5	1	3	3	2	3	9	4	8	6	1	5	1	5	8	1	0	1	8	1	2
	%	0	6	0	3	25	13	16	3	9	9	6	9	28	13	25	19	3	16	3	16	25	3	0	3	25	3	5
2	N	4	4	5	10	5	4	3	4	10	3	3	8	5	2	5	1	7	4	0	3	55	1	2	0	6	0	6
	%	13	13	16	31	16	13	9	13	31	10	9	25	16	6	16	3	22	12	0	9	16	3	6	0	19	0	19
3	N	11	3	11	10	10	3	9	7	8	10	9	15	3	7	3	4	10	4	3	4	7	5	4	0	2	0	6
	%	34	9	34	31	31	9	28	22	25	31	28	47	9	22	9	13	31	13	9	12	22	16	13	0	6	0	19
4	N	6	6	3	6	2	7	3	2	4	6	7	1	1	8	5	3	2	0	8	6	2	3	1	1	4	2	4
	%	19	19	9	19	6	22	9	6	13	18	22	3	3	25	16	9	6	0	25	19	6	9	3	3	12	6	13
5	N	11	17	13	5	7	14	12	18	7	10	11	5	14	11	11	18	12	19	20	14	10	22	25	30	12	29	14
	%	34	53	41	16	22	43	38	56	22	32	35	16	44	34	34	56	38	59	63	44	31	69	78	94	38	91	44
Total		32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Far West States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	0	3	6	6	5	5	3	3	6	1	1	10	4	8	5	4	5	4	2	4	3	2	0	2	8	1	2
	%	0	9	18	18	15	15	8	8	18	2	2	30	12	24	15	12	15	12	5	12	8	5	0	6	24	2	6
2	N	2	2	5	4	8	6	4	3	8	2	1	4	4	5	2	4	4	1	0	5	6	3	0	1	4	0	2
	%	6	6	15	12	24	18	12	8	24	6	3	12	12	15	6	12	12	3	0	15	18	9	0	3	12	0	6
3	N	12	4	6	7	7	4	7	3	8	4	5	2	2	5	3	3	4	2	6	6	3	0	1	0	4	6	4
	%	35	12	18	20	21	12	21	8	24	12	15	6	5	15	9	9	12	6	18	18	9	0	3	0	12	18	12
4	N	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	2	7	2	1	3	4	1	1	2	1	2	4	3	2	0	0	1	1	1	
	%	12	9	11	9	8	8	8	13	5	21	6	2	9	11	2	2	5	2	6	12	9	6	0	0	2	3	2
5	N	16	22	13	14	11	16	17	21	10	20	25	17	21	12	23	22	19	26	24	15	19	27	33	31	17	26	25
	%	47	64	38	41	32	47	51	63	29	59	74	50	62	35	68	65	56	77	71	45	56	80	97	91	50	77	74
Total		34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Rocky Mountains States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	0
2	N	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	0
	%	20	40	40	80	40	20	20	0	40	60	20	0	40	20	20	40	20	20	0	20	40	0	0	20	40	20	0
3	N	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	2
	%	40	20	20	0	40	40	40	20	20	0	20	20	0	40	40	40	0	20	20	40	0	20	0	20	20	20	40
4	N	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1
	%	20	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	20	0	0	20	0	0	0	40	0	40	0	20
5	N	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	2	0	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	0	3	2
	%	20	20	20	0	0	40	20	80	40	40	60	80	40	20	40	0	60	40	60	40	40	60	60	60	0	60	40
Total		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Great Lakes States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	3	4	4	7	8	9	8	6	15	5	3	11	6	9	7	2	7	4	4	5	13	1	2	3	3	0	2
	%	6	8	8	14	16	18	16	12	31	10	6	23	12	18	14	5	14	8	8	10	27	2	4	6	6	0	4
2	N	9	4	14	9	9	4	12	5	14	5	7	5	5	8	10	7	9	5	3	2	8	9	0	0	5	0	5
	%	18	8	29	18	19	8	25	10	29	10	14	10	10	16	20	14	18	10	6	4	16	18	0	0	10	0	10
3	N	7	8	10	16	17	13	2	5	2	9	9	6	7	10	11	7	12	6	3	3	8	5	3	1	10	5	8
	%	14	17	20	34	35	27	4	10	4	19	18	12	15	21	23	14	25	12	6	6	16	10	6	2	21	10	16
4	N	14	4	8	8	7	6	5	2	5	10	11	3	6	5	3	7	5	3	7	7	1	2	2	0	5	2	1
	%	29	8	16	16	14	12	10	4	10	20	23	6	12	10	6	14	10	6	14	14	2	4	4	0	10	4	2
5	N	16	29	13	9	8	17	22	31	13	20	19	24	25	17	18	26	16	31	32	32	19	32	42	45	26	42	33
	%	33	59	27	18	16	35	45	64	26	41	39	49	51	35	37	53	33	64	66	66	39	66	86	92	53	86	68
Total		49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Mideast States Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	1	5	10	5	3	9	4	4	9	6	6	13	6	10	5	2	6	2	1	3	9	5	1	3	8	1	3
	%	2	13	26	13	8	24	11	11	24	16	16	34	16	26	13	5	16	5	3	8	24	13	3	8	21	2	8
2	N	6	2	7	9	9	8	6	2	10	7	6	3	4	10	7	9	9	3	2	7	6	1	1	0	3	0	7
	%	16	5	18	24	24	21	16	5	26	18	16	8	10	26	18	24	24	8	5	18	16	3	3	0	8	0	18
3	N	9	5	5	10	10	6	7	4	4	6	4	2	7	10	5	4	4	1	5	4	7	2	1	1	4	0	7
	%	24	13	13	26	26	16	18	11	11	16	10	5	18	26	13	10	10	2	13	11	18	5	2	2	11	0	18
4	N	5	5	4	5	8	3	5	2	5	7	8	4	4	4	1	1	3	1	3	2	33	4	0	0	2	3	7
	%	13	13	11	13	21	8	13	5	13	18	21	11	11	11	3	3	8	3	8	5	8	11	0	0	5	8	18
5	N	17	21	12	9	8	12	16	26	10	12	14	16	17	4	20	22	16	31	27	22	13	26	35	34	21	34	14
	%	45	56	32	24	21	31	42	68	26	32	37	42	45	11	53	58	42	82	71	58	34	68	92	90	55	90	38
Total		38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

APPENDIX G

RESPONDENTS BY STIPEND STATUS GROUPS

Stipend Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	14	30	52	42	55	57	45	25	74	27	20	121	55	50	54	28	60	30	10	20	61	37	36	19	56	6	25
	%	4	9	16	13	17	17	14	8	23	8	6	37	17	15	16	8	19	9	3	6	19	11	11	6	17	2	8
2	N	53	42	86	88	80	55	58	30	99	38	33	56	46	50	65	55	66	30	18	36	66	36	34	8	59	8	43
	%	16	13	26	27	24	17	18	9	30	11	10	17	14	15	20	17	20	9	5	11	20	11	10	2	18	2	13
3	N	99	37	73	98	95	69	49	34	61	65	58	31	37	67	51	41	65	33	38	47	51	39	43	6	58	16	56
	%	30	11	22	30	29	21	15	10	18	20	18	9	11	21	15	13	20	10	12	14	15	12	13	2	17	5	17
4	N	67	36	38	37	41	40	51	29	36	58	66	26	36	54	35	50	37	25	42	51	34	35	29	4	45	20	36
	%	21	11	12	11	12	12	15	9	11	18	20	8	11	16	11	15	11	8	13	16	10	11	9	1	14	6	11
5	N	96	184	80	64	58	108	126	211	59	141	152	95	155	108	124	155	101	211	221	175	117	182	187	292	111	279	169
	%	29	56	24	19	18	33	38	64	18	43	46	29	47	33	38	47	30	64	67	53	36	55	57	89	34	85	51
Total		329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329	329
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

No-Stipend Respondents

Responses	Institutional Factors									Economic Factors				Situational Factors							Personal Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	N	1	17	26	16	10	15	14	13	31	10	7	5	10	25	16	15	19	5	8	11	20	10	16	12	16	6	6
	%	1	18	27	16	10	16	14	14	32	10	7	5	10	26	17	16	20	5	8	11	21	10	17	12	16	6	6
2	N	23	13	24	27	19	21	17	15	24	5	10	1	10	18	13	17	14	2	6	8	17	20	8	0	18	6	9
	%	24	13	25	28	20	22	18	16	25	5	10	1	10	18	13	18	14	2	6	8	18	21	8	0	19	6	9
3	N	24	15	11	27	25	11	17	14	16	12	10	5	11	31	14	14	11	4	11	12	10	9	12	3	22	9	16
	%	24	16	11	28	26	10	18	14	16	12	10	5	10	32	14	14	11	4	12	13	10	9	12	3	23	9	17
4	N	17	10	9	6	18	15	12	8	6	15	20	11	11	5	5	7	9	6	7	8	4	6	5	1	5	4	8
	%	18	10	9	6	18	16	13	8	6	16	21	11	11	5	5	7	9	6	7	8	4	6	5	1	5	4	8
5	N	32	42	27	21	25	35	37	47	20	55	50	75	55	18	49	44	44	80	65	58	46	52	56	81	36	72	58
	%	33	43	28	22	26	36	38	48	21	57	52	77	57	19	51	45	46	83	67	60	47	54	58	84	37	75	60
Total		97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
Percent		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

VITA

Robert Kelly Poinsett

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED NON-RESIDENT GRADUATE STUDENTS TO ATTEND AN OUT-OF-STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in St. Louis, Missouri, October 15, 1940, the son of Mr. and Mrs. William F. Poinsett

Education: Graduate from Central High School, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, in 1958; received the Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Southeast Missouri State University in May, 1962, with a major in Secondary Education; attended the University of Arizona during the 1962-63 academic year with study in the field of watershed management; received the Master of Education degree from the University of Missouri-Columbia in August, 1965, with a major in guidance and counseling; received the Bachelor of Divinity degree from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in December, 1967, with a major in theology; received the Specialist in Education degree from Central Missouri State University in August, 1973, with a major in higher education; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1975, with a major in higher education.

Professional Experience: Dean of Students at Okland City College, Oakland City, Indiana, 1968-1971; Associate Dean of the College and Assistant Professor of Education at Oakland City College, Oakland City, Indiana, 1971-1972; Service Coordinator, Title III Program, Educational Support Systems Center, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1973-1975.